

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 30, 1880.

The Week.

UP to the adjournment last week the incidental rather than the main business of Congress proved most interesting. In the course of the debate on Mr. Wood's Funding Bill, in Committee of the Whole, Gen. Weaver got the floor to express his undying opposition to any scheme of funding which took from Government the power to liquidate the national debt at its pleasure and convenience. Speaker Randall became engaged with him in the most deferential manner, but had the ill-luck to recall the Democratic opposition to the "act to strengthen the public credit"—namely, by declaring the bonds payable in coin and not in paper. Gen. Weaver improved the opportunity to read to the House a number of edifying extracts from Democratic platforms, State and national, showing the party's steady fall from grace from the time (only twelve years ago) when it wanted the United States bonds paid in greenbacks. While he himself had reached that doctrine by deserting the Republican ranks, the Democrats had gone on camping "every four years exactly where the Republican party camped four years before." Gen. Weaver's opponents had some difficulty in meeting his points, and in order to make their counter citations from Republican greenback platforms pertinent they had to charge him with treacherously playing into the hands of the Republicans during the late campaign. This led finally to his saying to Mr. Sparks, of Illinois, "The gentleman is crazy," and to Mr. Sparks's replying, "The gentleman states a falsehood"; and this again to threats of personal chastisement and exchange of "fighting weights" on both sides, and finally to—

"Mr. WEAVER:—I denounce the gentleman personally as a liar on the floor of this House.

"Mr. SPARKS:—You are a scoundrel and a villain and a liar, and if you get within my reach I will hit you."

The House, which had more or less enjoyed the fun of the debate, was in the mood for assisting in the encounter which these words provoked and nearly caused. The Speaker, indeed, had to resume his chair and call upon the Sergeant-at-Arms to appear with his mace.

Next day a fruitless effort was made to expel the offending members, but they were allowed to apologize, and the whole matter was laid on the table. In the Senate Mr. Morgan called up his resolution, offered at the last session, denying the Vice-President's right to count the electoral votes, and accompanied it with a dry rehearsal of the arguments going to prove not only the Vice-President's constitutional disability, but the absolute control of the whole matter by the two Houses, irrespective of any law passed or to be passed for the regulation of the count. Mr. Edmunds agreed with Mr. Morgan as to the Vice-President and differed from him totally as to the power of Congress, and disposed of the alleged urgency of the resolution by saying that the country would, in the present instance, see that the elected candidate was counted in.

Mr. Conkling took occasion on Wednesday week, in discussing the right of a Government employee to profit by an improved linchpin invented by him in part outside of his office hours, to make some remarks on the general right of the Government to control an employee's movements when his day's work is at an end. What he had in mind was, of course, the famous Executive order which forbade the participation of Government employees in the management of caucuses and conventions. He declared that when the Government attempts to follow the employee beyond the limits of his office hours, and tell him "whether, in hours which are his own, he shall devote his time to the efforts of inventive genius, or whether he shall attend religious or spiritual meetings, or political meetings, or shall do anything else, the Government, in his (my) opinion, is a tyrant—not a petty tyrant, as an individual might be, but a bald, insolent usurper," etc., etc. Now, these observations show that Mr. Conkling's estimable father made a mistake "in teaching him to reason and correcting his errors," for the parent's object in training his

son to detect fallacies was undoubtedly to enable him to avoid them. Had he foreseen that it would have been used by the son to construct fallacies for use in his business, in order to confuse and deceive his fellow-men, undoubtedly he would have withheld the instruction which has made so deep an impression on General Grant. In the case before us the son tries, in a way that would undoubtedly have pained his logical father, to make it appear that an office-holder attends "religious and spiritual meetings" in the same character in which he attends political meetings and with the same aims, and that, if you see no harm in his attending the former, you are estopped from objecting to his attending the latter. He suggests too, but does not say, that he himself would freely permit a custom-house officer under a Republican administration to attend political meetings of any sort—such as Democratic conventions—which he knows is untrue. If any custom-house officer did so, Mr. Conkling would himself be the first to appear "as a bald, insolent usurper" and demand his removal. In fact, if we accept as true General Grant's account of the Senator's logical education, his speech about this linchpin ought to warn all parents of the danger of teaching a boy to reason before they are sure that he has an honest mind. It is only to honest minds that logic is useful. To all others it is hurtful. It is to these what a good stroke is to the fraudulent professional oarsman, or a "pleasing address" to the confidence man.

The rejoicing over what is called the downfall of Kelly has been general and cordial, but in the light of recent municipal history and of Kelly's career it seems, we regret to say, somewhat premature. He has to be sure, in losing the comptrollership, lost the distribution of much patronage, but it is by no means upon the direct control of patronage that his influence in Tammany has exclusively depended. To Tammany he is still a great leader, and his recent reverse is accepted as a stroke of bad luck in a game to the rules of which his followers faithfully subscribe. The only really efficient means of dislodging a Tammany Boss has been demonstrated to be an indictment, although that is not to be implicitly relied upon under all circumstances. Moreover, Kelly has been in precisely his present position heretofore without serious loss to his prestige. He ceased to be sheriff as he has ceased to be comptroller, and at least twice before his management has brought defeat upon his party, and in spite of everything he has not only retained but strengthened his autocratic rule. After the "Hackett campaign" there was the same talk in the Tammany ranks of procuring some other Boss, but Kelly called his "Committee on Organization" together and proceeded to "discipline" refractory clansmen to such good effect that what threatened to become a revolution ended in an insignificant revolt. He has been doing the same thing the past week, and "serious defections" are reported in various districts, but the inference from this drawn by some of the papers, to the effect that his "power" is "crumbling," is no sounder now than hitherto. It will probably be true for some years to come that the best way to deal with Tammany as an organization is to defeat it as often as possible without being too much concerned as to who is at the head of it.

Although a broken week at the Stock Exchange, it was an exceptionally active one. The speculation was given an investment character by taking up dividend shares and applying to them all the arts used in handling "fancy" stocks; several of them were run up to prices never before reached and hardly dreamed of. The reasoning used is that the interest on more than \$600,000,000 United States bonds is to be reduced to 3 or 3½ per cent.; that investors will seek railroad bonds and shares; that they will buy the former up to prices which will yield 4 per cent., and the latter up to figures which will yield 5 per cent. annual income. As the leading railroads are now dividing 8 per cent. per annum, their business being profitable beyond precedent, it will be seen that the application of this reasoning to the stock market makes prices seem plausible which would otherwise be regarded as preposterous. There is no sign yet of the present speculative craze ending, and very likely the early part of the new year will witness a continuance of it. The banks are getting into stronger position; foreign exchange still

rules in favor of gold imports, but the arrivals during the week were comparatively small. The Treasury began paying out January interest on Tuesday, and the amount of its January disbursements will reach nearly \$25,000,000. The January dividends of various corporations will be larger this year than ever before.

We were undoubtedly mistaken in our estimate of the immediate consequences which would follow the coinage of a silver dollar worth more than the gold dollar, and persons who are preparing letters to us on the subject may therefore save themselves the trouble. The matter has little practical importance, however, as Secretary Sherman's proposal was simply to make the silver dollar equal to the gold dollar. Apropos of this, the London *Economist* points out that the price of silver in the London market has ranged from 51 to 54 pence per ounce since 1877, so that there would have apparently to be a readjustment every year in order to keep the two coins at par.

The English Court of Appeal has just rendered a decision which is likely to cause a good deal of surprise among lawyers and unprofessional men, both in England and the United States. The appeal affirms the decision of the judges below, to the effect that a wife has no right to pledge her husband's credit unless she is duly authorized by him to do so, as in the case of any other kind of agent. The impression has long prevailed that married women were at liberty to supply themselves with all kinds of articles suitable to their position in life on their husband's credit, but it seems that the English law now is that this right is derived solely from an authority conferred and revokable by the husband. If he has been in the habit of paying bills contracted by his wife with particular tradesmen, the authority may be implied from the course of dealing, but even in such a case it may be withdrawn at pleasure. Theoretically this decision is calculated to cause a joyful excitement among husbands all over the world, and a corresponding depression and melancholy among wives, but practically we doubt very much whether its results will be serious. Among well-to-do people it is a necessity of the case that there should be an authority from the husband to make purchases and incur expenses of all kinds, and it is unlikely that this authority would be revoked or qualified except where matters between husband and wife had become seriously complicated, and in fact reached the point of an open quarrel. Among the poorer classes the right of pledging a husband's credit has at no time been a valuable privilege, the husband in most cases having no credit to be pledged; at the same time in some instances the right may be of use for the purpose of marital discipline, and may therefore be recognized as among the few remaining legal privileges of married men as such.

It is difficult to make out from the cable despatches the precise scope of the telephone decision rendered in England. The practical effect of the decision is to make the purchase by the Government of the telegraphs cover all future inventions for the transmission of messages by electricity; and since the decision the Post-office has made a public announcement that it is prepared to furnish the means of communication by telephone throughout Great Britain. The case will be appealed, but the decision of the lower court is unanimous. There would seem to be great room for a difference of opinion as to the meaning of the words "electric signals" in the act of Parliament. Electric signals are undoubtedly made use of in the telephone, but only for the subsidiary purpose of bringing the persons who desire to use the instrument into communication with each other. This having been done, the subsequent communication is not by means of signals, but is entirely oral, precisely resembling ordinary conversation, with the exception that the transmitting medium is different and the interval of space is greater. As a matter of law the decision must, unless reversed, be regarded as right, but it would be a very high handed act for the Government under it to appropriate the private telephones throughout the country, for the very plain reason that at the time of the Government purchase of the telegraphs the telephone was not an existent invention, and no purchase of it was contemplated or dreamed of by either party to the transaction. This has nothing to do, of course, with the construction of the words in the act of Parliament. It cannot be said that the result furnishes to the opponents of Government monopolies a new argument against

them; it rather furnishes a new argument against the loose manner in which statutes affecting private rights are drawn up.

The South Carolina Legislature has been doing some excellent work. One of its acts provides very stringent penalties for duelling, which will be effective if juries can be got to enforce them. Another exempts immigrants from taxation for three years after their arrival. We would recommend, however, in addition to this, and as a supplement to it, the provision of a good pension for all persons maimed in "personal difficulties," and aid for their wives or children or aged and infirm parents, in case of their death. If a community enjoys or tolerates savage fights on its streets and highways, it ought in common decency to pay something for the fun. If it expects men on pain of disgrace to cut and shoot those who offend them, it ought to provide for the disabled and for the families of the fallen, just as it provides for the wounded and the families of the slain whom it forces into the army in time of war. In shooting and stabbing, South Carolina and Mississippi now stand in the same scale as Albania and Corsica. Montenegro and Sicily have, we believe, risen above them in self-restraint and respect for law. The Albanian, however, has the advantage in manliness, as he carries his weapons in a large belt on his stomach, in full view of everybody, so that any one who does not care for discussion with him can keep out of his way. In South Carolina and Mississippi, on the other hand, one may any day get into a dispute with a gentleman who in dress and other externals has the air of a minister of the Gospel, but has concealed in his pockets behind his back the full outfit of a brigand and assassin of the worst type.

The contract between Dr. Talmage and the publisher of the *Advance*, the nature of which he is accused of having misrepresented in his testimony on his trial before the Presbytery, has been printed and published. It is formal and imperative in its language. It is dated October 4, 1876, and its second clause binds Talmage to "cease his editorial connection with the *Christian at Work* in one month from October 12, if not before," and "in the next issue—i.e., October 12—of the said *Christian at Work* to announce and state that he is now become editor of the *Advance*." Another agreement, made on the 9th of December following, refers to this first contract as "a contract mutually signed and agreed to" by the same parties. On the trial Dr. Talmage swore on his direct examination that when he went down to his office on the morning of the 9th of October, five days after the execution of the first contract, he "had no idea" of writing and printing the valedictory in the *Christian at Work* announcing his transfer to the *Advance*, which he did write and print on the evening of that day, and he added that not only had he "no idea" of it when he left home in the morning, but had none "at any other period." The first contract he described as "a memorandum," which was "not finally concluded until the afternoon in October 9." In his cross-examination he repeated "that the finality of our arrangement [that is, with the *Advance*] had not been reached on the 9th," but protected himself against questions as to whether he had any idea of writing the valedictory when he left home in the morning of the 9th by declaring that he "did not remember." He testified on the direct examination, however, that on leaving home in the morning "he was much impressed with the fact that something decisive might happen that day," so much so that after leaving his house he went back, ascended to the fourth story, "locked the door, and knelt down and asked God that whatever he might be called to do that day he might do with reference to the judgment, and that he might be directed in every thing." As a consequence of this he felt sure "that he made no mistake in that," for "he had the theory that if our religion is not practical enough to get direction when we do not know what to do, there is not much in religion." That is, we suppose, if it does not help a man in making a bargain it is of no great value. It seems a little hard under these circumstances to prosecute him for perjury, but perhaps his enemies have been "getting direction" also in the same manner, and feel sure they are right in following him up. It is reported that he declines to answer the charge under advice of his "counsel," another minister, Dr. Spear, which, if true, is a very dull introduction into the spiritual forum of the methods of accused officials at the City Hall. We may

hear before long of a well-to-do Catholic going to the confessional attended by his lawyer to see that he does not criminate himself too deeply.

By the way, the prosecutors must not overlook Major B. R. Corwin, the prominent member—perhaps elder—of Dr. Talmage's church through whose instrumentality the contracts are said to have come to light. This gentleman witnessed the first contract, and probably knew its contents. If so, and he now thinks Dr. Talmage committed perjury in the account he gave of it, he ought to be disciplined vigorously for sitting silent in the Tabernacle ever since April of last year, and giving the world to understand that he thought the pastor a spotless man. We also beg to direct the attention of the ecclesiastical authorities to C. H. Howard & Co., the proprietors of the *Advance*, who have laid themselves open to a similar charge on stronger evidence. The vigorous pursuit of the whole party will, *pace* Dr. Field, be a good thing for the Church and the world, and especially for the young men in the theological seminaries, whom the success of the "sensational" preachers has now for some years been debauching.

Mr. Trescott has come back from China bringing the new treaty with him, but refuses to give any sign as to its contents until it has been submitted to the Senate, or to say whether the reports about it which have appeared in the American papers are correct or not. There is, however, no doubt about one thing, and that is that the obligation to admit Chinamen to this country without let or hindrance has been abrogated, and that restrictions on their coming may now be imposed by this Government; so that if the treaty shall be ratified by the Senate, and acted on in legislation, Republicans as well as Democrats will have given their sanction to the doctrine that race *does* make a difference in men, and that all races are by no means equally well qualified to live under the Stars and Stripes. What is odd about this is, that the same men recognize the reasonableness on the part of the Californians of a view of color which when taken by the South Carolinians and Mississippians rouses them to fury.

The exhibit made by the Secretary of the Treasury of the condition and prospects of the finances of the United States, and the immense refunding scheme foreshadowed in it, has naturally made a deep impression in Europe. No such pecuniary ease has ever been witnessed on the part of a really great state in modern times. Prussia had savings in the treasury from the time of the great Frederic down to the French war, and the Canton of Berne had a considerable hoard, which, if we remember rightly, was gobbled up by the first Napoleon. Venice, too, used to be what the farmers call "forehanded"; but none of these were great states, or handled the enormous sums which flow in and out of the American Treasury. The credit of the United States now all but reaches that of Great Britain, and if it continues below it, it will be due to the creditors' fear of being paid off too soon. Probably the oddest effect of this extraordinary financial spectacle on the European mind appears in the case of the London *Spectator*, from which it elicits the reproach that so rich and prosperous a Government should do something to help struggling and oppressed peoples, but does nothing, which is shameful. This is a very extraordinary charge—leaving out of sight what the United States *does* do for the unfortunate of other climes—considering that it is only one year since Great Britain was working both by arms and diplomacy to put Christians back under the Porte, or prevent their escape, and was slaughtering Afghans and burning their villages because they refused to receive a British envoy. The whole business of succoring "oppressed nationalities" is an immense snare and delusion. To do so with effect an enormous military or naval force has to be kept on foot, which, when there are no oppressed ready for deliverance, is very apt to be used to do a little oppression just to keep the men in practice.

The trial of the Land-Leaguers opened on Tuesday in Dublin, but at this writing the proceedings have not gone beyond the impanelling of the jury. We beg to call Judge Davis's attention to the fact that Chief-Justice May has been so impressed by the public indignation over his unseemly attack on the defendants when deciding a preliminary motion for the postponement of the trial, that he has announced that he

will not sit in the case. Opinions still seem to vary as much as ever about the probable result of the trial, but the chances are undoubtedly in favor of a disagreement of the jury. Jurors, even in the cities, are becoming afraid of being "boycotted"—that is, of having their business ruined by refusals to deal with or employ them. Captain Boycott himself, however, has made a good thing by his sufferings, inasmuch as \$70,000 have been raised for his benefit by voluntary subscription, while he claimed only \$30,000 from the Government. Mr. Bence Jones is gallantly holding his own, with the assistance of armed retainers, and will have materials before long for a very entertaining magazine article. To Mr. Forster's circular calling on the magistrates to enforce the existing law against the perpetrators of outrages and rioters and "boycotters," 700 magistrates have replied that it is out of their power to do so. They can get no evidence on which they can act. A new and very ugly symptom of the crisis is the beginning of attempts to assassinate the police, who have hitherto been allowed to pass harmless, and who, as they patrol in twos and in the night, are very much exposed. There are already thirty thousand troops in Ireland, but they are, of course, useless except against an armed outbreak, of which there is no sign. The Leaguers have hit on a more effective process than open rebellion. The question whether those defendants in the pending trial who are members of Parliament—five, we believe, in all—will be able to appear in their places in the House on the 6th of January is growing in interest as the day draws nearer, owing to the determination of the Leaguers to resist any attempt to pass a coercion bill by every means in their power, fair or foul, and the absence of Parnell, who is a master in the art of obstruction, would be a serious blow to them. He talks, it is said, of defying the court and going over to England.

But it is now positively announced that a coercion bill will be introduced as soon as Parliament meets, its leading feature and the most effective one being the suspension of the *habeas corpus*. The English and Scotch members of all parties and the majority of the Irish members will support it, and there can be no reasonable doubt that as soon as the Government has the power of arbitrary arrest the intimidation of the Land League will cease, because its directors will have to fly or go to jail, and the minor ones will fly. The Cabinet will introduce a Land Tenure Bill, it is announced, simultaneously with the Coercion Bill, and it will contain in some shape the "three f's," and probably provide for emigration on a large scale from the western coast, where the soil is so wet and the climate so bad that "fixity of tenure" would be a curse. This is all very well, but the pity of it is that it should not have been done before Parnell had plunged the country into anarchy. It teaches once more the old and bad lesson of Irish politics, that the British Parliament never takes up Irish grievances seriously until the reign of violence has begun. The land movement, apart from the violence, has spread to Ulster, and it is conceded on all hands that a radical change in the system of tenure is unavoidable.

The Powers are reported to have all agreed to settle the Turco-Greek dispute by arbitration. The Turks are apparently ready for this or for anything which causes delay, but the Greeks are not. The present Premier declares that Greece will take nothing less than the award of the Berlin Treaty as confirmed by the Supplemental Conference, and will fight for it if necessary as soon as the spring opens. Turkey offers as a compromise a considerable increase of territory, but proposes to retain Janina and Metsovo. Janina, however, is to the Greeks of prime importance, and in this she will not yield. As arbitration involves the voluntary submission of the matter in dispute by the disputants, its success in the present case does not seem probable. The only form of coercion the Powers can bring to bear on the Greeks is refusal to assist them in case they go to war, but this will probably be neutralized by the fact that the Greeks believe they can drive out the Turks themselves, and that in any case they will be aided by risings in Macedonia and Rumelia. Sir Charles Dilke asserts positively that Austria is acting in cordial union with England; but the Greeks are undoubtedly suffering from the British troubles in Ireland and South Africa. In the latter the Boers have had some slight successes, but reinforcements are hurrying out rapidly, and their independence, as they are not a warlike race, will be short lived.

THE DUTY OF THE DEMOCRATS TOWARDS THE TARIFF.

NOW that the Democrats seem disposed to provide themselves with a set of principles, and to meet the Republicans on some other ground than the desirableness of "a change," it is rather surprising that they are not giving more attention to the issue made up for them in the last canvass by the open committal of the Republican party to protection as a fixed and permanent policy. Tariff reform is not very far removed from civil-service reform, and in the latter the Democrats have begun to profess a very lively interest. Some revival of attention to the former, too, is rendered the more necessary on their part by the extraordinary abandonment of the "tariff-for-revenue-only" plank in their platform, by which they made the late campaign so memorable, and by the fact that a hostility to high tariff is now the one tradition by which the Democrats of to-day can maintain their historic relation to the Democrats of the period before the war. Everything else is gone. If the Democrats of our time can stand the present tariff with complacency, there is no more connection between them and the men from whom they have taken their name than between them and the Whigs. The crudities and absurdities of our present tariff are admitted on all sides, and every report emanating from the Treasury Department adds fresh proof of the difficulties in collecting the revenue under it. In spite of this there is no denying the fact that the universal interest which the people of this country formerly took in tariff legislation has ceased to exist.

With the great increase in the inland Western population the proportion of the people which comes into contact with the revenue service has greatly diminished and is steadily diminishing. It is now only an insignificant minority which has any personal knowledge of the inconveniences and burdens under which importers carry on their business. In the last generation, when the tariff controversy greatly occupied the public mind, nearly everybody lived within easy reach of the seaboard, and had some acquaintance with the conditions and uses of foreign trade. Now the great bulk of the population knows and cares little about it, or thinks of it simply as a process by which mischievous luxuries are imported for the rich. This growth of what may be called a powerful inland opinion has also constituted, and still constitutes, one of the difficulties of the currency question. The Eastern man, being largely engaged in the business of exchange with foreign countries, and being still strongly influenced by the traditions and experience of a time when foreign trade was a principal part of American activity, is naturally greatly impressed by the international function of money. The Western man, on the other hand, who, though he finds a market for a large portion of his commodities abroad, has little direct share in the work of exporting or importing, thinks it preposterous that foreign opinion or practice should have any influence on our monetary legislation, and, in fact, tends distinctly towards that condition of exclusiveness which Mr. Stanley Matthews expressed so naively when he asked, in one of the silver debates, "What have we to do with abroad?" The difficulty there has been, and still is, in procuring any legislative assistance in recovering our share of the carrying trade, is another illustration of the same preponderating influence of inland opinion and interests. The Western man cares little about the carrying trade. He feels none of the shame which fills the dwellers in the sea-ports at seeing it all done under a foreign flag, and he turns a deaf ear to the appeal for free ships or free ship-building materials. It is thus easily seen that, even putting aside the consideration of the extent to which the inland population has engaged in manufactures that owe their existence or prosperity to the present tariff, it would be no easy matter to revive the old interest which once made the tariff the battle-ground of the two great parties. It will be twenty or thirty years before the West comes again into close commercial relations with foreign countries which the mass of the people will see and appreciate.

The consequence of all this is that if the Democratic party should now take up the tariff reform as an issue—and the events of the late canvass seem to make it impossible for them to avoid it—they will have to take it up as a matter of principle as well as a matter of expediency; that is, they will have to show that tariff legislation for indiscriminate and perpetual protection is unjust as well as unprofitable and self-destructive. They will have to infuse a good deal of pure

free trade into their demands for a tariff for revenue only, and they will not under the most favorable circumstances find it a subject that their orators will take to kindly at first. We are still so much dominated by "war issues," and have had so much experience of what may be called dramatic politics, that it will take some time for the public to get back to the state of mind in which the champion of a high tariff was a popular hero. The curious way in which the tariff question has now to have a sugar-coating of sentiment in order to make it useful for campaign purposes, was well shown in Mr. Blaine's appeal to the Irish last summer to stand by the high tariff, because if it were lowered they would get the goods of their English enemies and oppressors cheap. In Indiana and Ohio, too, there was little or no discussion by the Republicans, any more than by the Democrats, of the tariff theory. What the orators said was, that if the Democrats got into power they would suddenly lower the duties and American artisans would be thrown out of employment, which might be all true and yet the high tariff be a very bad thing.

In whatever way the discussion may be managed, however, nothing but a clear and decided advocacy of a "tariff for revenue only" by the Democrats seems likely to force the Republicans to admit the necessity even of tariff reform—that is, to set about the excision of the absurdities and crudities of the present tariff and to consent to a moderate reduction of duties. In a discussion between free trade and diminished protection there would be a good deal to be said on both sides, since a sudden and total abandonment of the protectionist policy is, of course, not to be thought of. No party would think of facing the financial convulsion which any such step would cause. But the indefinite maintenance of the present tariff is equally out of the question. Many leading protectionists admit this, and are prepared to submit to extensive modifications of it. The real reason why these modifications have not been made before now is, besides the lack of popular interest in the subject in the interior, which we have above described, that no political party has asked for them. The Democrats have now for so many years neglected the real work of an Opposition that the Republicans have really been left to correct their own extravagances and errors at their own time and in their own way, and self-correction by a political party is, as every reader of history knows, a very slow and uncertain and imperfect process. Considering how the Democrats have behaved, the wonder is that the Republicans have done so much, and what they have done has had somewhat the air of a sovereign grace. That worst feature of the war tariff, the moiety system, and the monstrous machinery of coercion by which it was supported and executed, went on for years in this city without being taken up by the Democrats, until the Republican officials went too far and publicly pillaged a leading Republican merchant. It was then reformed. The revision of the tariff, too, will have to be brought about by its being made the Democratic "main question." There will very little if anything come of keeping tariff reform on hand as part of a "miscellaneous assortment" of issues, to be displayed now and then in platforms, like the silks and shawls in the window of a dry-goods store, and it will have to be advocated by men who are really interested in it and understand it. It is a question which cannot be successfully handled by men-of-all-work. There are, unfortunately, but few of the Democratic orators of later years who have given much attention to it, but younger men are coming forward and can be had whose advocacy will have the ring of conviction.

MUNICIPAL AND FEDERAL REFORM.

MR. EDWARD COOPER, after having, by the aid of a combination in the Board of Aldermen, succeeded in making certain appointments of city officials which two years ago it was expected he would make immediately upon his election, will go out of office at the end of this week. It cannot be disputed that in many respects the new men are better than the old, nor that Mr. Cooper has by means of this "deal" given the city a chance of better government than it has had of late; but neither Mr. Cooper nor those who united in securing his election can feel overjoyed at the way the thing has been accomplished. It is rather instructive to compare the publicly-announced expectations of the supporters of Mr. Cooper two years ago with the results. He

was nominated by a union between anti-Tammany and Republican politicians, but he was supported by that large body of voters which has for some years fluctuated between the contending factions, as the cause of municipal good government seemed to make it for their interest to do. One of their chief organs has always been the *New York Times*, and in the fall of 1878 the *Times* had a great deal, naturally, to say about Mr. Cooper and the probable results of his election. Notwithstanding the many disappointments it had had to endure at the hands of former mayors, its hopefulness had never been greater, as a few extracts from its columns will show. Two weeks before the day of election it pointed out that Mr. Cooper's "thorough acquaintance with the details of municipal affairs" would "render him incapable of being used by men who are ready to turn to questionable account their knowledge of the intricacies of local administration." A few days later it returned to the subject in these words:

"Apart altogether from the very rigid scrutiny which a reform mayor would be expected to make into the way in which the work of heads of departments has been done during the last two years, and the removals he might possibly find it necessary to recommend, the new appointments falling within his term involve an all but complete reorganization of the city government."

This was followed by one or two predictions and friendly warnings:

"If we can elect Mr. Cooper and a majority of anti-Tammany aldermen we put an end to the corrupt and extravagant policy which the dictator of the local Democracy has imposed upon the city. . . . It is but seldom that such an opportunity presents itself for ridding New York of the incubus of incapacity and corruption which is working its ruin. Those who fail to turn the opportunity to good account will demonstrate their unfitness to exercise the rights of American citizenship."

On November 5 the *Times* addressed a few "Last Words to Republicans," reminding them that "the Republican who hesitates about voting for Edward Cooper, the candidate of the people," as against Schell, "the candidate of John Kelly," on account of the connection between Cooper and Tilden, "debases partisanship to the level where it winks at corruption and apologizes for fraud." It took occasion at the same time, rather comically, to warn the reform candidates against "selling out" their associates.

On the 6th, Mr. Cooper having been elected, together with a majority of four in the Board of Aldermen, the *Times* announced the result as a complete triumph for reform, and expressed its gratification as follows:

"There is hope for free institutions even among the uneducated and half-Americanized mass of New York voters when the arrogant dictation of a would-be political despot has been met by a protest so unmistakably emphatic."

It also proceeded to draw a glowing picture of the blessings in store for the city:

"No mayor since Mr. Havemeyer has had such an opportunity to confer the blessings of good government on New York as will be enjoyed by Mr. Cooper. That he will prove as conspicuously equal to the opportunity as his predecessors have been unequal, we do not entertain the slightest doubt. He has been chosen mayor unhampered by a single pledge, untrammelled by either personal or partisan obligation. He was the people's candidate and he is the people's choice. To them alone belongs his responsibility, and their interests, we feel assured, will be his sole standard of duty."

During the same period the *Tribune* was more lukewarm in its support of the Reform ticket; but it devoted itself with considerable success to one of the topics always supposed to be intimately connected with municipal reform, and succeeded in getting not only Mr. Cooper but John Kelly and Augustus Schell also to pledge themselves in favor of an absolutely non-partisan Police Board, so that on the 2d of November it was able to announce as the result of its efforts that "we are thus secure from any successful effort to handle the police as a partisan machine."

We think we are speaking within bounds when we say that not only have the predictions not been verified, but they have been reversed. Mr. Cooper's thorough acquaintance with "the details of municipal affairs" has not, in fact, rendered him incapable of being used by politicians. He has never been able to institute any rigid scrutiny into the work of the heads of departments, and so far from being "unhampered by a single pledge" or being "untrammelled by either personal or

partisan obligation," his whole official career has been a fulfilment of pledges and obligations. As for security from the use of the police as a "partisan machine," his term of office has been mainly marked by the fiercest partisan efforts on both sides to get control of the Police Board—efforts which no sensible man believes will come to an end even through the recent bargains. That he has had the interests of the public and the city at heart we have no doubt, but the means employed by him to advance them have been solely a series of intrigues by which he has attempted to get, and after two years has finally succeeded in getting, a majority of the Board of Aldermen to confirm his appointments. Most of his nominees have been obscure politicians who have been selected by him, not on account of their fitness for the positions offered them, but for the sake of getting the support of their friends for other nominees of the same class.

In this respect there is a curious resemblance between the careers of Mr. Cooper in New York and Mr. Hayes at Washington. There are, of course, many points at which the parallel would not hold good. Mr. Hayes is President of a nation of fifty millions of people; Mr. Cooper is merely mayor of its largest city. Mr. Hayes, in his efforts at reform, has had to deal with the Senate, a very powerful legislative body, the members of which hold their offices for a longer term than his own, and divide among themselves the patronage which in theory belongs to him. Mr. Cooper has found opposed to him a mock legislative body composed of small city politicians, whose power consists in the opportunity they enjoy of refusing to confirm his appointments. Allowing for these differences, however, what was expected of these two reformers was very much the same. They were both expected to promote efficiency of administration; to see to it that fitness should be the sole test recognized in appointments; and that Boss government, or government by senatorial "groups" (which are essentially the same thing), should be brought to an end. Both were supported and elected by a body of voters who were comparatively independent of party, and mainly interested in reform. In Mr. Hayes's case, exactly as in Mr. Cooper's, the most liberal promises were made by his friends of what he was going to do, and most extravagant hopes were expressed of the benefits likely to flow from the administration of so good a man. It must be confessed, even by those who take the most cheerful views of what Mr. Hayes has done, that he has effected no more towards eradicating the evils of the system at Washington than Mr. Cooper has effected in New York, and for precisely the same reasons in the two cases. Instead of recognizing the fact that good government, like any other good thing, must be fought for, and that what they should have done at the outset was to declare open war not only upon the abuses which they meant to break up, but upon the men who were the living embodiment of the abuses, they apparently made up their minds that the true way was to secure reform through precisely the same kind of intrigue and bargain which have made the abuses so strong. No man in any position can in our time effect any reform without public confidence and support, and this is only won by appeals to public opinion.

Now, reform through intrigue and "dicker" does not appeal to public opinion, or touch the popular imagination, or rouse the popular conscience, or stimulate popular hopefulness. It is essentially a secret process, and essentially a process which involves much base, or seemingly base, compliance, and much seemingly close association with the men who are themselves "part of the thing to be reformed." The way to reform is to reform. The way to purify the civil service, whether municipal or Federal, is to begin by trying to purify it, and to keep trying, and by making every attempt so plain and conspicuous that the dullest man in the country can see what you are aiming at. It may be that the system of reforming by the aid of a little corruption, to which the Mayor and the President have resorted, has merits and sometimes attains its ends. But, even if this be true, the system is open to the fatal objection that the public cannot understand it and is discouraged by it, and that it therefore cannot lead to any radical or permanent improvement. Mr. Hayes, by his concessions to the Boss system, not only has not conciliated the Bosses or destroyed their power (he might have failed to do this under any circumstances), but he has weakened public confidence not simply in his own sincerity but in the practicability of the reform, and strengthened the confidence of all the enemies of reform in the permanence of the abuses by which they live and prosper. In like

manner, when Mayor Cooper disregarded the appeals made to him to nominate a fit and proper person for the Commissionership of Charities and Correction, and nominated a German butcher who knew and cared nothing about either charity or correction, he did not increase his own influence for good over the corrupt classes; on the contrary, he satisfied them that he was weak and that they could use him, and he did dishearten those who elected him in the hope that he would prove the broom of reform which the *Times* described him to be. When a man in President Hayes's or Mr. Cooper's position makes even one conspicuously bad nomination, he destroys all interest in the subsequent good ones he may make. The public, feeling that it has been deceived once, feels that it may be so again, washes its hands once more of "politics," and turns to money-making and barren grumbling. The Senate and the Board of Aldermen find a ready escape from all responsibility or odium in the undeniable assertion that the chief executive officer is just as ready for a "bargain" as they are, and that it by no means follows that they are guilty of obstruction because they do not act readily on his nominations.

The only way in which the system of administration, whether in a city like New York or in the country at large, can be permanently improved is by men in the positions occupied by Mr. Hayes or Mr. Cooper making up their minds that they will rely for support in their efforts for reform solely upon the merits of these efforts; that they will secure the confirmation of their nominees not by means of bargains but by the excellence of the nominations themselves, relying on public opinion to force the politicians to come round to their side in the long run. No one who watches the signs of the times with any care can doubt that the public was never so ready as it is at the present moment to come to the support of any intelligent, independent, and fair attempt to break up the system which throughout the country has brought politics to a dead-lock and made intrigue and favoritism the road to power. There has been no time since the war when party ties have been so loose, party passions so feeble, and the general desire for good government as good government so widespread. But the resolute opposition of the politicians themselves must always be counted upon, and any one who attempts to improve matters by resorting to their tricks may see in the results of such well-intentioned efforts as Mr. Hayes's and Mr. Cooper's exactly how much and how little they are likely to effect.

GEORGE ELIOT.

MANY qualities doubtless contribute to render George Eliot a unique figure in English literature, but among them the most conspicuous is the absolute absorption of her personality in her work, so far as the interest of her public is concerned. To have made so marked an impression upon the literary history of her epoch, and yet to have made so little stir in the world in which she passed a life of sixty years, at a time when nothing that happens goes unchronicled, implies a curious contradiction. It is partly due, of course, to the fact that her life was comparatively uneventful. Probably there was little in it upon which the curiosity felt by the romantic concerning the private life of authors of distinction could feed had it been permitted. Unlike other famous writers of her sex, she did not move in society at all; she neglected it too completely as Marian Evans to be charged with compulsory seclusion as Mrs. Lewes. And though correspondents who, it afterwards appeared, were confident of their ability to divulge inoffensively all they had learnt, were made welcome at Combe Priory, they learnt, as a rule, little to divulge. The lady was small, plain-featured, intelligent-looking, observant rather than animated—in short, a well-bred Englishwoman. Everything else was hearsay. Such a "portrait" of her as Sainte-Beuve used to paint of eminent women, or such a book as Mr. Trollope recently made upon Thackeray, would be impossible in the case of George Eliot. But what is still more singular is that not one in twenty of her readers would probably care for a "portrait" or biography of her, or be interested in sifting the chaff and wheat of the meagre hearsay concerning her. Marian Evans is to readers whose interest in George Eliot is intense a vague and, by comparison, wholly unattractive personality, which it is possible, of course, for a reader to fancy this or that, but only by a kind of speculation proverbially (and here peculiarly) liable to error. Our own notion of George Eliot, for example, which is that of an exceptional but pure mentality, is obviously inapplicable to Marian Evans. In fine, not only was the life of the latter placid to a degree unsuspected, perhaps, before her marriage testified to what could excusably be called an unconquerable serenity of character, but the former is characterized by an objectivity almost unexampled. This is a quality well known long before syste-

matic critics insisted on it as a necessary element in all art, and is doubtless older than Homer, but surely it was never before illustrated to a degree which not only disguises but eliminates interest from the corresponding subjectivity to which it owes its origin.

It is obvious that this is overdoing the matter, and the fact not too unreasonably stimulates speculation. Obviously Shakspeare's impersonality is less uncompromising and saner. Is it not possible, one is inclined to ask himself, that Miss Evans was affected by that part of her environment connected with her sex to a degree and in a way not generally set down in sociological textbooks, but recognizable enough to George Eliot, had she met with it in any one; that she more or less consciously proposed to herself to obliterate the sex distinction not by the vulgar method of aping masculinity in specific performances, but by aiming to make of herself an intelligent force rather than a person with idiosyncrasies? What is certain is that George Eliot strikes an attentive sense as being not so much masculine as sexless. One speaks of her masculine strength, her masculine this or that, correctly enough if "unfeminine" is meant, for no writings betray less the feminine point of view in dealing with questions in discussing which other literary women of genius inevitably do betray it. Explanations after the fact are easy, but we doubt if a candid reader would discover anything vital in George Eliot to indicate the author's sex. The femininities are, to be sure, unmistakable; but they are all detail—phases of a pedantic elaborateness which no man of equal gifts would risk writing, for example, but wholly superficial beside the general treatment of character and emotion, which is often far beyond the reach of feminine intuitiveness. Her treatment of sex itself, whenever it is in point, is, speaking with precision, masterly. Any one can illustrate this to himself very vividly by thinking of the contrast presented by George Sand. Take the Tessa episode in 'Romola' as an example of many easily found, and reflect how George Sand would have treated it, how much more we should have been moved by it in that event, but how certainly we should have felt the necessity of supplementing the picture by various unideal but important touches inspired by reflecting on the constitution of society as it exists outside of George Sand's world of passion. In 'Romola' these have all been thought of with masculine prevision and sobriety.

This is unquestionably a great merit. The more enthusiastic of the admirers of George Eliot have this in mind doubtless when they speak, as they never tire of doing, of her masculinity. But evidently this has corresponding disadvantages. Whether or no it has the disadvantage of being unnatural, it is perhaps idle to discuss, the feminine disposition being a subject upon which there is great difference of opinion just at the present day; but axiomatically it may be said to have a tendency hostile to strictly feminine excellences. As a matter of fact, in George Eliot's writings many qualities generally associated with the softer sex, but by no means incompatible with the other, are exhibited up to precisely the point at which a masculine mind would take them, but there dropped with almost automatic definiteness. The result is that in certain directions there is an evident limitation of effect. One has never quite the sense that the matter in hand has been carried to the utmost limit, and that every consideration in the world unconnected with its development has been thrown aside for the moment. There is plenty of reserve, and reserve with suggestiveness is always in some sense more effective than explicitness, but nowhere an absolute abandonment guided solely but securely by the original force of artistic rectitude, which after all is the finest thing. The result is less charm and less power. We are not, of course, content with being profoundly moved by a novelist, but require to be moved rightly as well, before the effect upon us is in any degree the measure of an artist's merit. But to be moved is the first thing, and, as a rule, George Eliot is content with interesting us. The entertainment she provides is in general of a high order. Sometimes, as in the chapter introductions of 'Romola,' drenched in the commonplace, it is tolerably dull; sometimes it is alternately wearisome and exasperating, as in the elaborate inanities of 'Daniel Deronda.' But when she eschews didacticism and teaches philosophy by examples it is of the first class. To the alert-minded and curious reader few pleasures can be greater than that of being taken by the hand, as it were, and conducted through the gallery of George Eliot's character-portraiture by the artist herself. She is then far more attractive than when she is elaborating those sententious epigrams which modern compilers of "elegant extracts" collect with equal ardor and awe. There is too much exactness in this figure, however; admirable as is the portraiture, one seems to be listening to a lecture upon it, which is enjoyable but should be needless, after the fashion in English fiction "ever since"—to use the words of a writer once mistaken for George Eliot—"fiction has taken a turn, for better or worse, for analyzing rather than depicting character and emotion." 'Daniel Deronda' is the jejune exaggeration of this; it tinctures all the predecessors of that book, and the germ of it is plain in the first sketch the author ever made. To carry such a load requires a genius as robust as Thackeray's, and Thackeray is at his best when he fails to encumber himself with it. But whereas with him it is incidental, it becomes with George Eliot, owing to the predominance of a turn for philosophical subtlety over a turn for art, the warp and woof of her

weaving, the thing she most insists on, and finally, with a fine irony of retribution, the thing her fanatical admirers most admire her for. How fatal it is to the depiction of passion, to dramatic movement, to the picturesque play of the natural emotions of man engaged in active warfare with the restraints of a highly developed artificial civilization—which is the modern novelist's topic, as it is the theme of the modern poet—one needs only, as we say, to think of the other extraordinary woman of the century to appreciate.

In the case of a writer felt to be so indisputably important as George Eliot, we may be sure that she is at her best somewhere else than where she has successful rivals. Her truest note—indeed her only true note, one may almost say, so conspicuously is it her own—is struck in a sentence of her first story, in which she says: "Depend upon it, my dear lady, you would gain unpeakably if you would learn with me to see some of the poetry and the pathos, the tragedy and the comedy, lying in the experience of the human soul that looks out through dull grey eyes and that speaks in a voice of quite ordinary tones." To call 'The Sad Fortunes of the Rev. Amos Barton' George Eliot's best and most truly characteristic work would be to provoke the derision of the eulogists of 'Daniel Deronda,' but slight as it is we believe it could be so called more truthfully than the more celebrated story. Its personages are drawn with a firm hand, and the "pathos in their very insignificance," of which the author speaks, is affecting enough. The 'Scenes of Clerical Life' were published when George Eliot was nearly forty, and they are as mature—fully as mature—as 'The Impressions of Theophrastus Such.' The low-toned picture, with its grey lights and deep shadows alternating across a wholly unremarkable scene, was followed by others of the same sort in 'Adam Bede,' 'The Mill on the Floss,' and 'Silas Marner' successively. 'Romola,' with all its Florentine mellowness, 'Felix Holt, the Radical,' and 'Middlemarch' are not essentially different. The element of fate pervades them all as distinctly as it does the Greek drama, and it is a force conceived in the spirit characteristic of a century at the birth of whose literary movement the influence of Byron outweighed that of Shakspeare. The drear and gloomy strain in George Eliot's novels, which some critics notice with regret and ascribe to the unfortunate influence of Auguste Comte, we believe is nothing but the melancholy which for some reason or other in the more serious work of the Victorian age has wholly excluded the blitheness of the Elizabethan. The finely conceived though somewhat laboriously elaborated character and career of Tito Melema, in 'Romola,' is an admirable embodiment of a phase of it. The fortunes of the brother and sister in 'The Mill on the Floss,' where, on her native heath, the narrator is unencumbered with the impedimenta of erudition, are another. One writes glibly of George Eliot's manner of dealing with the character she can conceive but cannot vivify, of her deficiency in dramatic movement, of her appeal to the mind exclusively, but 'The Mill on the Floss' asserts itself a triumphant exception to very nearly all that one can say of deficiencies. It is unquestionably its author's highest reach, and its power is unmistakable in plot, situations, and characters. The spirit of the sociologist gives place to that of the true romancer in the portrait of Maggie Tulliver; the subtlety often awkwardly evident elsewhere finds a fitting subject for its exercise in that of her brother; the subsidiary portraits, too, are gems, notably Mrs. Glegg; and the elopement and the climax are not only tragic, but tragic with a poetic truth in comparison with which the tragedy of 'The Spanish Gipsy' is purely rhetorical, and that of 'Daniel Deronda' false and hollow. Yet, if we were to select from its various excellences the masterpiece of the book, measured not by the keenness of emotion excited but by a real standard, we confess we should fix upon the character of Tom Tulliver. And as her grey-toned picture is her best, so her colorless characters exhibit her finest art. Tom may stand for the archetype of colorless character. None of Trollope's personages are to be compared with him, which is almost reckless praise. Rosamond Vincy is nearly his equal, and a dozen rivals readily recur to the mind in the various novels. In depicting them—one may begin with the Rev. Amos Barton and verify the statement—the truth that moral character is composite is accepted as elemental, and starting with this goal of an inferior artist the author's skill is expended in exhibiting the multifarious mosaic as it exists in obedience to its own law, rather than as arbitrarily conceived by herself.

The difference between the perfection of such art as George Eliot's, however, and that of which Shakspeare is the highest example is one of kind, and to ignore it is to darken critical counsel. It has been said that Maggie Tulliver and Dorothea Brooke are the product of keen introspection, and whether or no the character they share is that of their author, it is clear that here, as elsewhere, their author's faculty is observation rather than divination. Perhaps observation was never before carried so far; it is small wonder that George Eliot has been called the romantic interpreter of the Spencerian philosophy, as this is commonly understood. In keenness it has certainly been equalled by such writers as Mr. Thomas Hardy and Mr. Henry James, jr., but in range it has never been approached. What is surprising is that so admirable a faculty so remarkably developed should have been so widely misconceived, and that her critics should claim for George Eliot imagination and high poetic power. There never was a work less marked by

these qualities than 'Romola,' unless it be 'The Spanish Gipsy,' and in each the theme protests vigorously against the lack of them. Everywhere one notices the curious mind, the examining, critical, discriminating, scientific spirit, with the extremity of analysis for result. The style itself betrays this, at its best as at its worst, and owes to this the fact that it is so often at its worst. Its viciousness in 'Daniel Deronda' is evident, both because it is exaggerated and because it clothes meagreness, but any one who takes the pains to refer to 'The Sad Fortunes of the Rev. Amos Barton' will see that it is inherent. And at its best it frames sententious "saws" rather than gospel truths. Further confirmation might be drawn from the deliberateness of her composition, and despite the perfection to which she brought the method, we suspect it will never be found a wholly satisfactory substitute for the ideal synthesis of the imagination, and that this is why George Eliot will, after the dust of controversy is laid, be assigned not to the second rank of novelists, but to a position in the first after Fielding, Thackeray, Balzac, George Sand, and Turgeneff, whom alone one thinks of associating with her, and who share with Shakspeare the inner method, one may say. Whether or no, with all her remarkable success, she would have done better to have relied less upon a woman's empirical observation of life and the world, and more upon the natural force of an uncommon genius, it is, of course, idle to guess. 'The Mill on the Floss' occurs to one's mind, and provokes profitless surmises.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF VICTOR HUGO'S GENIUS.

PARIS, November 25, 1880.

THE bibliography of Victor Hugo's works, to which I alluded some time ago, is not as easy a task as might be supposed. The débuts of our great poet are now well forgotten; they took place in a magazine called the *Conservateur Littéraire*, of which Asselineau, who published the first bibliographic details on the "romantiques," gives the following description: "Le *Conservateur Littéraire*, Paris, Le Normand, Pichard, Pelicier, Portheu, 1819-1820, 8vo, in thirty livraisons, forming three volumes." This review, which has become excessively rare, was founded by Eugène and Victor Hugo, and chiefly written by Victor; their brother Abel, the eldest of the family, also wrote some articles in the third volume. The other collaborators are now well forgotten, with the exception of Alfred de Vigny, of Émile Deschamps, of Alexandre Soumet (these last two are stars of the smallest magnitude). Victor Hugo was only seventeen years old when he began to write. There are in the *Conservateur* twenty-one articles signed V. These articles are critical essays on the 'Sicilian Vespers' of Casimir Delavigne, on Lamartine's 'Méditations,' on Walter Scott's 'Ivanhoe,' on Moore's 'Lalla Rookh,' on Madame Desbordes-Valmore's 'Poésies,'—on many other works, poetical and historical, which have lost their importance. Each number of the *Conservateur* opened with a few pages of poetry, and these the founders regarded as the most important of their work. Victor Hugo had this department to himself, but the poet of 1819 was very unlike the poet of the following years. Victor Hugo has, nevertheless, introduced seven of the poetical fragments of the *Conservateur* in the successive editions of his 'Odes'; he has left ten other poems buried in the *Conservateur*, thinking them probably unworthy of himself. These ten "péchés de jeunesse" are political satires, translations from the Latin, and various poems. The political satires have for their titles "L'Enrôleur politique" (signed V. M. Hugo), "Épître à Brutus," "Les Vous et les Tu" (signed Aristide). The various poems are entitled "L'Avare et l'Envie: Conte" (signed D'Auverney*); "Les derniers Bardes" (signed V. M. Hugo); "Ce que j'aime, vers faits à un dessert" (signed D'Auverney); "Le jeune Banni, Raymond à Emma," an elegy (signed D'Auverney); "Les Deux Âges," idyl (signed V. M. Hugo). The translations from the Latin, chiefly of the 'Æneid,' are all signed D'Auverney.

The novel of 'Bug-Jargal' appeared without a signature in the second volume of the *Conservateur*. It was composed in 1818, and was Victor Hugo's first work. He made many changes in it in the edition of it which came out in 1826 ('Bug-Jargal, par l'auteur de Han d'Islande.' Paris: Urbain Canel. 1826. 1 vol. 18mo), with a drawing by Deveria representing "Hadibrah cherchant à entraîner Léopold d'Auverney avec lui dans l'abîme." Victor Hugo afterwards collected many of his first prose articles in the *Conservateur*, under the title of 'Journal des idées, des opinions et des lectures d'un jeune Jacobite.' This 'Journal' formed the first part of a work, 'Littérature et philosophie mêlées' (1834), in two volumes, published by Renduel, in what is called the first "collective" edition of his writings. Is it worth while to mention 'Le Télégraphe,' a satire of a few pages published in 1819 by Delaunay; 'Le Génie, ode à M. de Chateaubriand, par Victor-Marie Hugo' (1821)? 'Bonaparte, ode' (1822) is better known, as well as the 'Ode sur la naissance de S. A. R. Monseigneur le Duc de Bordeaux, suivie d'une ode sur la mort de S. A. R. Charles Ferdinand d'Artois, duc de Berry, fils de France, par Victor-Marie Hugo, de l'Académie des Jeux Floraux' (1822). This ode was read on the 3d of May at a sitting of the "Société des

* Auverney is a village near Chateaubriant, where the mother of Victor Hugo had a small estate.

Bonnes Lettres," presided over by Viscount Chateaubriand. Victor Hugo was then a Jacobite, as he had called himself in the *Conservateur*. It was his first manner.

In this same year, 1822, appeared a small 18mo volume, now very rare, entitled '*Odes et poésies diverses, par Victor M. Hugo*' (Paris: Pélicier, place du Palais Royal). It was offered to King Louis XVIII., who opened it and said: "C'est mal fagoté." The paper was grey and bad, the types were thin and worn out. Louis XVIII. was very hard on the modest little volume, which had in its preface these lines: "There are two intentions in the publication of this book—one political, one literary; but in the author's conception the former is the consequence of the latter, as the history of men offers nothing poetical if it is not judged from the height of monarchical ideas and of religious belief." *Quantum mutatus ab illo!*

The novel '*Han d'Islande*' appeared in 1823. It was published by Persan, a ruined marquis turned bookseller. It was not signed by Victor Hugo, and the publisher could not pay the author; the paper of the four 12mo volumes is miserable, and the types are what we call "têtes de clous." Victor Hugo had a quarrel with Persan, and they exchanged letters in the papers called *L'Éclair* and *Le Miroir*. Persan pretended that he had still five hundred copies unsold of '*Han d'Islande*,' the half of the original edition, when Hugo, who had not been paid, announced a second edition. Persan had published the second edition of the '*Odes*,' which is now very rare—'*Odes, par Victor M. Hugo; seconde édition, augmentée de deux odes nouvelles*.' Two years afterward appeared the '*Nouvelles Odes, par Victor M. Hugo*,' having Ladvoeat's imprint, and a frontispiece by Deveria, "the Sylph." Ladvoeat published the third edition of the '*Odes*' in 1829, with a frontispiece by Deveria, "the Bat." One day, says the author of '*Victor Hugo raconté par un témoin de sa vie*,' Victor brought to his betrothed a paper well pinned and tied. She thought there was in it a precious flower, and opened it cautiously: a bat came out of it. She was much frightened, and only forgave the poet when she read on the paper the ode on the bat. This ode is one of the first in which the true Romantic spirit is shown, a spirit which cannot be well defined, but which became so singularly apparent in the following '*Odes et Ballades*.'

Victor Hugo was still a Jacobite, and in 1825 he published at the "Imprimerie royale" an ode on the coronation of Charles X., full of royalist enthusiasm. The epigraph of this poem is:

"Os superbum conticescat;
Simplici fides acquiescat
Dei magisterio."

This ode is now one of the rarest of his productions. In 1826 appeared the '*Odes et Ballades*' (Ladvoeat). The frontispiece by Deveria is very characteristic of the times. It represents a sailor in a boat tossed by a tempestuous sea. This sailor contemplates Napoleon standing on the rock of St. Helena, dressed in the legendary *redingote*, with the "petit chapeau." The Bonapartist vein, which was now showing itself under the Jacobite surface, is even more apparent in '*La Colonne de la Place Vendôme*,' published in 1827. The poet was approaching what may be called his poetical zenith, and he became very sensitive. Napoleon struck a chord, the Greeks struck another; and in 1829 he published, through Gosselin & Bossange, '*Les Orientales*,' first edition, 8vo. The frontispiece presents a "clair de lune," with a young woman in oriental dress looking at the moon, and on the front page there is a coarse wood engraving representing "the Djinns." The '*Orientales*' are perhaps the most extraordinary poetical effort in all our modern literature; all the old traditions are lost; the Victor Hugo who was in a modified form still an imitator in his first poems, is now himself. The '*Orientales*' are a divination; they not only speak of the East, they are the East, full of fanaticism, of heroism, of cruelty, of passion, of sun. Even now I cannot read them without having a sort of physical sensation; they are warm, they make my blood run quicker. The poetical form, the rhythm, the wild play of passion, are all admirable. The language is marvellous in its richness; the novelty of the images is almost amazing. It seems as if the poet had drawn a veil from our eyes, or shown us nature in a new and more splendid form. This new literature was called Romantic, in contradistinction to the Classic; but nothing can be more classic than some of the '*Orientales*,' if you understand by the term a form which is in such perfect harmony with the thought that you feel in it something definitive. In the old poets, in Corneille, in Racine especially, you meet occasionally with expressions and images which seem borrowed from the Romantics. Can anything be more Romantic than "Cette obscure-clarté qui tombe des étoiles" ('*Le Cid*')? Can there anything be more classic than the complaints of the "captive"?

"Si je n'étais captive
J'aimerais ce pays,
Et cette mer plaintive
Et ces champs de maïs;
Et ces astres sans nombre,
Si le long du mur sombre
N'étincelait dans l'ombre
Le sabre des spahis."

Has the music of poetry ever found anything more melodious than the end of the same piece?

"Mais surtout, quand la brise
Me touche en voligeant,
La nuit, j'aime être assise,
Être assise en songeant;
L'œil sur la mer profonde,
Tandis que, pâle et blonde,
La lune ouvre dans l'onde
Son éventail d'argent."

Can we wonder if such verses were received with the warmest enthusiasm, if the poetry of the '*Odes et Ballades*' and of the '*Orientales*' seemed like a new spring, like the flowering of a divine mind?

Strangely enough, what I may be allowed to call the monstrous side of the genius of Victor Hugo was developing at the same time as the charming and the beautiful side. In this same year, 1829, when the '*Orientales*' were published, appeared '*Le Dernier Jour d'un Condamné*.' This gloomy, awful, monstrous analysis of a convict appeared first anonymously. It seems as if the author of the '*Orientales*,' living in the rays of Olympus, was ashamed to enter into the dark cell of the convict. In the '*Orientales*' and in '*Le Dernier Jour d'un Condamné*' we have already all Victor Hugo—the painter, who cares only for surface and for light, and the minister of the soul, who delights in the dark abysses of conscience; the light-hearted poet and the dismal humanitarian; the lover of beauty for the sake of beauty, and the conscious admirer, or rather advocate, of ugliness, of crime, of monsters. The two sides of his nature will from this year 1829 go on developing themselves simultaneously and almost independently; and in the poetical drama this double nature will find a single expression. "Hernani" and "Ruy Blas" represent, in the highest form, the double character of Hugo's genius; the two deities of good and evil of the Persian mythology. Ormuzd and Ahriman are united in this new dramatic school in a manner unknown to the ancient dramatists.

Correspondence.

THE ARISTOCRACY OF OFFICE-HOLDERS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The most interesting feature of your suggestion respecting the aristocracy of office-holders is the introduction of an appeal to experience instead of *à priori* theory in discussing a political question. The best way to determine whether permanence in office will make an office-holder indifferent to public opinion, and discourteous in his treatment of those with whom he comes into contact, is to investigate whether this is really the case where persons do actually hold their offices in permanence. You allude to several instances of this sort, but not to one which is well known to all who have occasion to transact public business—namely, that of officers of the Army and Navy. All the bureaus and many of the subordinate offices in the War and Navy Departments are presided over by men whose tenure is more permanent than any yet proposed for the civil service. On the theory of those opposed to civil-service reform these men ought to be the least attentive to the requirements of the public and the least courteous in their demeanor to those who have occasion to meet them. It is hardly necessary to state that such is not the case.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 24, 1880.

INTERNATIONAL COPYRIGHT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In my communication of last week upon International Copyright I ought, perhaps, to have rendered it clearer than I did that my remonstrances against the "assumptions of deliberate and predetermined bad faith" were intended for Mr. Reade and not for the *Nation*. The quotations made from the two sources would, I thought, have sufficiently enabled you to apportion my remarks between them.

At the same time allow me to express my regret that you should, in your comments upon my communication, continue to ridicule the efforts and impugn the motives of those whom I described as "honorable men . . . seeking honestly to adjust complicated and delicate relations in an untried field." As you repeat a former expression of "approval of the general scheme of copyright covered by the Harper treaty"; as that scheme differs in no essential principle of morals from the "Philadelphia copyright scheme"; as the principles involved in both have received the approbation of the leading authors of England and America, and of all the publishing houses here who favor international copyright, it is, to say the least, a little inconsistent, as well as unfortunate, that you should declare my calling all these gentlemen "honorable men," etc., "a little amusing." The settlement of the question heretofore has not been advanced by the similar exhibitions of lack of tact and lack of courtesy—or rather of justice—to which all those who have advocated a practical measure of international copyright have been exposed, and I am sorry to find the *Nation* inclined to continue the same objectless warfare.

I must protest, moreover, as utterly unfair, against your perverted use of

my phrase concerning "unauthorized republication," and your assertion that "in the publishers' interest, as Mr. Lea very frankly says, the thing most to be dreaded is the possibility of absolutely preventing 'unauthorized republication.'" Now, Mr. Lea said nothing of the kind, whether frankly or otherwise. He pointed out that, in the interest of authors other than those of pre-eminent reputation, it was desirable to prevent the publisher in the home country from surreptitiously securing both markets, and that this could only be accomplished by fixing a limit after which "unauthorized republication" would be legal if the foreign copyright had not meanwhile been perfected by an authorized reprint. To wholly prohibit "unauthorized republication" without providing that authorized republication shall take place within a specified time, is simply to surrender both markets to the home publisher in the case of little-known authors. All this was clearly enough set forth in my previous communication, and to represent me as urging it "as if the very object of the bill were to secure the privilege of unauthorized (pirated) republication," is simply a specimen of perfectly immoral dialectics.

The theory of the "Harper treaty," of which you approve, and of the "Philadelphia bill," of which you seem to disapprove, is that each country shall manufacture its own books, and this theory is accepted on all hands except by the London publishers, who appear to desire no international copyright that shall not confer upon them a monopoly of both markets. This theory can only be reduced to practice by imposing a limit of time within which the authorized republication must appear. What that limit ought to be is a question about which people may honestly differ without having their motives impugned after the fashion of the *Nation* and of Mr. Charles Reade. No limit can be so adjusted as accurately to suit each and every case. You assert that sixty or ninety days would be a hardship to the "unknown author." I consider that I have already proved that it would be a benefit to the "unknown author," but if in this I be mistaken, I add that the "unknown author" is not the chief factor in the problem, to which all the rest should be subordinated; that but a small percentage of the voluminous works of the "unknown author" receive, in the absence of copyright, the compliment of even "unauthorized republication," and that the "unknown author" is usually content if his early efforts can reach the public without expense to himself, counting upon the reputation which he expects from them, and the profits to be derived hereafter from that reputation. It is so rare for the "unknown author" to develop into a Herbert Spencer that the use of that gentleman's name by you as an illustration is hardly justifiable, but it leads me to suggest that if Herbert Spencer's early works had been protected by international copyright without limit of time, it is not likely that they would have been reprinted at all, and that the growth of his reputation, which I believe was considerably stimulated by the American circulation of his books, would have been correspondingly retarded.

As regards the comparative merits of the "bill" and the "treaty" methods of reaching the objects sought for, I may add to my previous remarks that I am a sufficiently strict constructionist to believe that what is specifically assigned to Congress by the Constitution should be strictly confined to Congressional action. I am opposed, as a general principle, to legislation by the Executive, and as the subject of copyright is among those specially enumerated in the Constitution as delegated to Congress, it seems to me one in which settlement by treaty is peculiarly improper. Besides this, the secrecy under which, by law or usage, all diplomatic negotiations are carried on, is a very serious drawback to the arrangement by diplomacy of questions such as this, with which the diplomats have no practical familiarity—nor, for the matter of that, the Senators appealed to for ratification—while those who could advise or guide them are, by law or usage, kept sedulously aloof, and even the ubiquitous newspaper reporter is not allowed to keep the public informed of what is going on. The "Harper treaty" may be laid in a very satisfactory shape before Sir Edward Thornton and Mr. Evarts, but who knows what its shape may be when it shall come before the Senate? Who, in fact, will have a right to know until it is proclaimed as the law of two hemispheres, to be obeyed by English subject and American citizen? This is not a mode of legislation which befits a free country, and I, for one, protest against it.

Before this communication can appear I expect to be at sea, beyond the reach of the *Nation* for some months, so that you will have the privilege of the last word. Use that advantage, I pray you, without abusing it; and believe, at least for once, that I speak truth when I say that I regard the interest of authors and publishers as identical in all general questions of legislation, however antagonistic and competitive they may be in specific and individual transactions. Whatever legislation benefits one class will, in the long run, benefit the other; and while I would, with you, invite the closest scrutiny of authors into all measures proposed by publishers affecting their common interests, I would not, with you; do so in a spirit of unworthy suspicion on either side.—Very respectfully,

HENRY C. LEA.

PHILADELPHIA, Dec. 25, 1880.

[Mr. Lea has by this time sailed on a yachting voyage for the resto-

ration of his health, which has been impaired by labors the value of which to literature as well as to the country can hardly be rated too highly. We therefore offer him the highest mark of editorial esteem and good wishes by letting him have the last word.—ED. NATION.]

THE GERMAN PRESS ON AMERICA.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your Berlin correspondent makes but too true a remark when, in his November correspondence (in No. 804 of the *Nation*), he says that "the editors [of the German papers] are quite ignorant of American constitutional and political history, that they do not even look into the written Constitution, and consequently have no idea how the election takes place, how and when the result is ascertained or the President officially declared elected." To this pungent remark permit me to give you some curious illustrations, taken from the foremost German newspaper, the *Koelnische Zeitung*, a weekly issue of which, dated Nov. 5, is before me at this writing. In this number an editorial treats of the Presidential election in the United States, and tells its readers that the electoral ballots are opened by the Congress and that the President-elect enters upon the duties of his office on the first of March! If poor Tilden had had this editor for an expounder of our Constitution he would surely have been the happy or unhappy inmate of the White House during the last four years. Further, the article in question suggests that the Democrats do not expect to carry the election this year, but they do "build their hopes upon the extraordinarily large German-Irish immigration of this year, which will, of course, be able to turn the scale in the Presidential election of 1884." The editor of the *Koelnische* must certainly have a strong belief in the coffee-pot naturalization power of Mr. Senator Wallace. He is also of the opinion that the campaign this time was exclusively a party, not a personal question, as in 1876! But he thinks there is something else, "that sounds a little curious for America and, according to current views, would be far more in place in a military republic, like France. Hancock and Garfield"—I translate verbally—"are both generals, but as if this show of military glory were not enough, there stands behind each of them, as the first star of the party, a still higher military authority—behind Garfield Grant, behind Hancock McClellan. This military side is the most prominent peculiarity of the present Presidential election!"

Sapienti sat. If the leading newspaper of Germany, which has a regular correspondent in New York, displays such ridiculous ignorance of American politics, what can be expected of the smaller fry of German papers, which look upon Americans as nothing better than Indianized barbarians?

Your correspondent, however, ascribes this ignorance to an alleged lack of able correspondents on this side of the ocean, because the immigrants of '48 are dying out or returning to the old Fatherland. It is a mistaken idea (though largely entertained in Germany, and with a certain kind of infallibility) that all the wisdom of German-Americans is confined to the exiled revolutionists of '48. But the truth is that there has never before been such a large influx of educated Germans as during the last decade. They have also tried to serve the German press. In fact, it is almost their first business here to correspond for one or other German paper. But they invariably drop such correspondence after a short time, for two reasons: first, it does not give them steady enough employment, as on an average only a monthly letter is required. Consequently they turn to other pursuits, which, in most cases, take them entirely out of the field of journalism. And, secondly, they become in the course of time too good Americans to be further available as correspondents for the German "reptile-press." It is not nor can it be the policy of a servile press to make its readers too well acquainted with the advantages of a republican form of government, which guarantees every individual the utmost freedom and equality. To blackguard our institutions is what they expect of their correspondents. It has therefore become a general experience that whenever a German savant has crossed the ocean to milk his countrymen here, the first thing he does when he returns home is to libel America in general and the German-Americans in particular. The latest exhibition of this kind has been that made by Mr. Bodenstedt, whose observations on this country, after having been feasted here to the full extent of his poetical merits, are almost entirely concentrated in ridicule of our large—spittoons!

I. S. E.

BUFFALO, N. Y., Dec. 17, 1880.

REORGANIZATION OF THE SUPREME COURT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I trust that in the discussion now flagrant in your columns concerning the proposed relief of the Supreme Court one anomaly in our judicial system which has not yet been alluded to will not be wholly lost sight of. This anomaly is the co-existence throughout the Union of two courts of first instance, held for the most part by the same judge, and yet in some matters subordinated the one to the other, so that the same magistrate, sitting to-day

in the same room where he sat last week, is called upon to review the alleged errors of his judicial action on the former occasion. The State of New York, for example, is divided into three districts. In each district there is a District and a Circuit Court, each having wholly distinct original jurisdiction. Every suit for the infringement of a patent must be brought in the Circuit Court; every libel in admiralty must be filed in the District Court; and so eighteen paragraphs of the Revised Statutes define the classes of cases of which the latter courts take jurisdiction, and twenty paragraphs declare the jurisdiction of the former.

Now, how are these courts constituted? Every State is at least one judicial district; and as several States are divided (and divided with much less regard to the requirements of litigants than to the successful urgency of some Senator or Representative at the time of the division), there are fifty-eight districts in the thirty-eight States. Each district has its district judge who alone (except when another district judge is called in upon some exigency) can hold its District Court. Each district has also its Circuit Court. But the Circuit Court is held either by any two, or any one, of these three judges—the district judge for the district, the circuit judge for the circuit, and the justice of the Supreme Court assigned to the circuit; the whole country being divided into nine circuits, each having a circuit judge, and the nine justices of the Supreme Court being distributed among them by assignment of the Chief Justice. As matters of actual practice, I think it is but seldom that the justice of the Supreme Court descends from his Olympian heights to hold a Circuit Court, and then too often as a *Deus ex machina* for some fancied exigency, as when Mr. Justice Hunt came to Canandaigua to order a verdict of conviction of Susan B. Anthony for illegal voting. It is hardly more often that two of the three are seen together on the bench, for the judicial economy cannot afford such an expenditure of material. And in most districts, I venture to affirm, the Circuit Court is held more days by the district judge alone than in any other way.

Now, I submit that when the congestion of the Supreme Court docket is the subject of a clinical consultation, the doctors should not overlook the abnormal condition of the extremities in their anxiety for the brain and heart, lest they "heal the hurt" but "slightly." No one can pretend that the system which I have described is anything better than an absurd anomaly, utterly unfitted for the needs of our existing communities; and it would be unfortunate if the present opportunity for substituting for it a reasonably convenient and adequate system should be wholly lost.

In such a system, too, it is thought by many lawyers who have had experience of intermediate appellate courts that they might well have a place. No New York lawyer would think for an instant of dispensing with that primary review of the courts of first instance which in that State is always interposed before the Court of Appeals is invoked. Not only does it operate to satisfy litigants, in innumerable instances, that further litigation is hopeless, but it greatly lightens and shortens the labors of the ultimate court, in many of the cases which actually go there, by narrowing the contention to the really vital questions. Nor does any one in that State doubt that, if that barrier were removed, the Court of Appeals, which is now coping successfully with a greater annual number of appeals than have utterly overslaughed the Supreme Court of the United States, would instantly and hopelessly succumb.

This comparison indicates, too, another radical reform which the federal judicial system demands, and that is that the justices of the Supreme Court shall be relieved of all other than appellate work. They are two more in number than the judges of the New York court; they are not less competent for their proper functions; the questions submitted for their action are not more various or difficult than those passed upon by the other court, yet they are unable to dispose of a smaller number of appeals than the State court decides, upon the whole, with eminent honor to itself and satisfaction to litigants. The last docket of the Supreme Court shows, of cases brought up in 1878, 282; in 1879, 326. The Court of Appeals calendar shows, of cases brought up in 1879, 386; of *remnants* from former years, 41; it received during the year very numerous appeals from orders as well as from judgments in cases having a preference, all of which were entitled to early hearing; and the court has adjourned before the day fixed, having heard every cause upon its calendar that was in readiness. It is very certain that this could not have been done if the members of that court had been compelled to spend part of the year in holding circuits in different parts of the State, from Essex to Chautauqua, nor, it may added, if they had been in the habit of devoting their Monday sessions to the reading out of their own opinions (which the bar could perfectly well get in printing from the reporter), instead of hearing the argument of two or three more causes.

Without taking more of your space (I am already asking for more than I intended) to support the suggestions offered, I submit them as a crude but earnest contribution to the discussion.

1. Abolish all original jurisdiction of the Circuit Courts; give the District Courts universal jurisdiction in the first instance, whether of actions originally brought in federal courts or removed from State courts; increase the number of districts, or of judges in each district, until they shall be indisputably ade-

quate to the business; or establish additional courts for special subjects, as admiralty courts in the great maritime and lake ports, and patent courts in the principal cities.

2. Let there be a Circuit Court in each circuit, of two or three judges, sitting by turns in the several districts, having only revisory power. But give the right of review in this court to every litigant, civil or criminal, and without regard to the amount in controversy, subject only to such moderate penalties by way of costs as shall discourage frivolous appeals.

3. Relieve the Supreme Court justices of all service except in that court. Allow the right of review of the Circuit Courts down to the limit of \$2,500, as well as in every case where there has been a dissent in that court, and in such constitutional or certified cases as might be provided for.

4. Establish such temporary tribunal as could dispose of the existing docket of the Supreme Court, and give the new organization a chance to "start fair."

5. Pay the judges as much as the bailiffs of their courts get; it would be extravagant to pay them the income of their clerks! But give the Supreme Court justices \$12,000; the Circuit, \$8,000; the District, \$6,000. And don't shirk the first duty a government owes to its citizens—that of establishing private rights and determining private controversies in the surest and swiftest manner—on the ground that it will cost too much. T. B.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., Dec. 25, 1880.

THE LIBRARY QUESTION IN CONGRESS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: During the last seventeen years the United States has been accumulating material for a National Library, the bulk of which, under a well-matured policy, is increasing in an annually advancing ratio. Should this policy be sustained for another equal period—and no disposition to abandon it is yet apparent—the nation will possess a larger mass of literary material than is now held by any library in the world.

The collection is yet, theoretically, but a development of the reference library provided in the Capitol for the two Houses of Congress and the Supreme Court. Mr. Spofford, the librarian, is recognized to be so signally fitted for his position as to be independent of the fluctuations of parties, and his judgment in all matters of the Library is generally accepted as decisive. Yet it is nine years since he reported the space now as then given to the collection to be inadequate for it. Since then the number of books on his hands has considerably more than doubled. The mass of pamphlets, maps, engravings, and other materials is increasing more rapidly than that of books, and space for anything like an orderly, safe, and convenient disposition of the collection in the Capitol has long since been exhausted. The larger part of the rooms assigned to the Library are used simply for storage, books being stacked in them like bricks from floor to ceiling, or packed in bins. Much of the unbound material is thus stowed away in the cellars of the Capitol. Not half the present stock in hand is available for reference. The condition of things was last year spoken of by Senator Voorhees as "a shame and reproach to the Government." It is certain that, after orders shall have been given for the purpose, it will be years before it can be substantially remedied. But though Mr. Spofford has every succeeding year implored Congress to act, the first step toward relief has yet to be taken.

But, after all, so much will be dependent upon the first step, and it is so important that it shall not be a false step, that this delay, so far as it means deliberation and not neglect, is a matter for congratulation rather than regret. The debates on the subject in Congress have been direct and sincere; no unworthy purpose has been apparent in them, and they have had the legitimate result of honest debate in the gradual submergence of hasty, crude, and short-sighted notions and the spread of sound convictions. The most formidable stumbling-block has been the impression, naturally fixed by the circumstances under which members of Congress have chiefly acquired their knowledge of the Library, that the entire collection is an adjunct of the halls of legislation, from which has followed the conviction that if the Capitol is inadequate to contain it, the Capitol must be enlarged. Several schemes for this purpose have consequently been proposed and much time has been given to a discussion of their several merits. The opinion of experts, both bibliographical and architectural, has constantly tended strongly to the conclusion that anything that could be done in this respect, not of a simply temporizing and futile character, would be obtained only at unjustifiable cost and by unwarranted sacrifices.

The conclusion seems to have been reached by the present Congress, at its last session, that a distinct National Library building is a necessity; that it must be so planned and placed as to stand well clear of all other buildings, must be in some degree protected by distance from street noises, and must admit of enlargement by the addition of successive sections as the accumulation of material increases.

At the close of the session a joint committee was appointed, with directions to consider and report upon the questions of site and of plan. Three

plans have been prepared by architects selected by the committee and studying the problem under its instructions, and it is understood that one of these will be recommended for adoption by Congress soon after the holiday recess. The question of site has been narrowed to a choice between two positions, one being the nearest private property to the Capitol on the east, with a face toward the present grounds on the carriage front of the Capitol, the other a public square, owned by the Government, lying about midway between the Capitol and that part of the city where at present most members of Congress and visitors have their lodgings. Each has advantages sufficient to secure strong partisanship, but neither such certain, permanent superiority on the whole over the other that a difference of opinion as to which is the better should be allowed to prevent a conclusion from being reached this winter. Failing this result, the matter will go over to a new House, with a large proportion of members fresh to the subject. This will be an indefinite postponement of it, and an indefinite postponement at this stage is equivalent to an order abolishing the Library of Congress for most practical purposes, and substituting for it at an early day a sumptuous warehouse for the storage in bulk of a great, idle, heterogeneous mass of printed paper.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 22, 1880.

F. L. O.

THAT "UNOFFICIAL" REPUBLICAN CAMPAIGN FRAUD. TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION.

SIR: In the *Nation* of December 2, I called attention to a card headed,

"From a Pamphlet issued by
"THE FREE-TRADE CLUB OF LONDON,"

as having been issued from Republican headquarters in New York City and Brooklyn, and characterized the same as a forgery, which it was. In the *Nation* of December 23 Mr. S. W. Dorsey denies that any such card "was ever written, issued, or circulated by the Republican National Committee, or by the State or any local committee, in great or small numbers." And he adds further:

"I should be glad to have Mr. Wells, who so swiftly denounces this card as a forgery, and holds the Republican National Committee responsible for its issuance and circulation, tell us who is responsible for the inexcusable blunder he is guilty of, in making so serious a charge without the slightest foundation in fact."

I am most happy to give Mr. Dorsey at once the information on which I based what he is pleased to term my "inexcusable blunder." The card in question was sent to me, in the first instance, by a young gentleman of Brooklyn the day after election without comment. Seeing at once that the publication was untrue and a forgery, I immediately wrote for information concerning its origin, and received in reply the statement that my correspondent obtained the card himself at the rooms of the Republican headquarters in Brooklyn, and also a package containing numerous duplicates of the same card, and of various other cards of similar character, printed in colors, and all obtained at the same place. These other cards, entitled "Hullo, there! What's that you say?" "Here we are again," "Keep this in your mind," and the like, although not open to the charge of being forgeries, are to that of ridiculous untruth, as is shown by the following quotations from one of them:

"The Democratic party will by their free-trade policy empty your workshop and your pocket, break up your happy home, and fill your poorhouse."

"The Republican party will protect your employer, so that he can sell his goods and keep you at steady work, with good wages."

And this from another, addressed to "Workingman":

"KEEP THIS IN YOUR MIND, AND DON'T YOU FORGET IT.

"Republican protection means plenty of work, with good wages, and empty poorhouses.

"Democratic free trade means closed workshops, starvation wages, and crowded poorhouses."

Another card contained in parallel columns comparisons of the wages received by bakers, blacksmiths, bricklayers, carpenters, joiners, laborers, porters, plasterers, painters, shoemakers, and plumbers in Europe and the United States, and attributed the wage difference in favor of these occupations in the latter country to the agency of our protective tariff, when the merest tyro in economic studies knows that these occupations are not and cannot be protected except by imposing restrictions on the importation of individual laborers, porters, bricklayers, etc. I refer to these other cards, since they were circulated with the card of which Mr. Dorsey knows nothing, and embody internal evidence almost amounting to demonstration that all were the work of one and the same agency, and emanated from a common source.

My Brooklyn correspondent further informed me that on the day after election all of these cards were strewn in abundance, with other campaign documents, on the floor of the Republican Committee-room in that city, and could be picked up in quantity. A day or two afterwards I

showed the card in controversy to a leading publisher (and a Republican) in New York, when he remarked: "Oh! yes; I know about it. I sent one of my clerks to the Republican headquarters for documents relating to the tariff proper for distribution among workmen, and received in return a package of these same cards," at the same time taking from a shelf in his counting-room all the cards I have referred to, including several duplicates of "The Free-Trade Club of London" card. Before the publication of my communication of December 2, I was also assured by a gentleman holding a well-known public position in New York City that he was cognizant of the circulation of these cards by Republicans, and had contemplated writing to the press on the subject.

The names of the several persons I have referred to as the sources of my information I have communicated to the editor of the *Nation*, and if Mr. Dorsey desires to have an investigation I am ready to co-operate with him. I also send duplicates of the cards mentioned with this communication to the office of the *Nation*, where they can doubtless be inspected by those who desire to do so.

When counterfeit money in considerable quantities is traced in two separate instances, by separate witnesses, to the private apartments of one and the same person and into the custody of his agents, it may not be wholly justifiable to charge knowledge of and participation in felony on such person; but, at the same time, the individual who makes public the facts in question is not usually regarded as having laid himself open to the charge of being "guilty of an inexcusable blunder" in so doing, and as having "not the slightest foundation in fact" for his statements.

DAVID A. WELLS.

NORWICH, December 27, 1880.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Mr. Dorsey goes too far in his criticism of Mr. Wells's letter, published in your issue of December 2. The card which furnished Mr. Wells with his text, and of which I enclose a specimen, was freely distributed in Brooklyn from the rooms of the campaign committee on Pierrepont Street. When I visited the rooms I found a number of them side by side with other standard campaign documents, such as "The Tariff Question," "A Talk with Business Men," "Why the Mechanic and Laboring Man Should Vote the Republican Ticket," and others of like character. There is not the slightest doubt that this card was as freely circulated as the above-named documents, and was intended to play an important part in intimidating laboring men into voting the Republican ticket by placing the tariff question in a false light. Mr. Wells is perfectly justified in speaking of it as he did.

Respectfully,

WORTHINGTON C. FORD.

BROOKLYN, 97 Clark Street, Dec. 22, 1880.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Senator Dorsey writes to the *Nation* of December 23 to say that no such cards as those denounced by Mr. Wells were issued by the Republican National Committee or from its headquarters, and there was, therefore, no foundation for Mr. Wells's statement concerning such distribution. The Senator is in error on this point, for copies of the card in question certainly were issued from the Republican headquarters. I was myself heartily interested in the success of the Republican ticket, and hearing from Democratic friends that these bogus cards were being distributed by the Republicans, I maintained that this distribution was doubtless carried on by certain manufacturers on their own responsibility, and that it was not likely the party committees had anything to do with so petty a piece of business. To convince my friends that such was the case, I sent a messenger a few days before the election to the headquarters of the Republican National Committee, requesting to have sent to me supplies of any cards they were distributing for campaign purposes. I received, among others, a batch of the card quoted by Mr. Wells, a copy of which I enclose herewith. My Democratic friends had the satisfaction in this instance of being in the right, and as this happened to them so seldom during the campaign I was obliged to forgive them. Requesting, as a matter of justice to Mr. Wells, the publication of this confirmation of his statement, I am, yours very truly,

GEO. HAVEN PUTNAM.

NEW YORK, December 28, 1880.

Notes.

ESTES & LAURIAT, Boston, have published an authorized edition of Madame De Witt's 'Monsieur Guizot in Private Life—1787-1874,' translated by M. C. M. Simpson. Our readers are already informed, through our Paris correspondence at the date of the original publication, of the character of this interesting work.—Ginn & Heath, Boston, have brought out ten of the twenty volumes of their "Harvard edition" of Shakspeare, edited by

the Rev. H. N. Hudson, and most tastefully printed and bound. A less glossy paper is the only desideratum which we can indicate, and this can yet be supplied. By lamp-light the page will be somewhat trying to the eyes. The introductions and notes are commendably brief and unpedantic. The series will be completed within three months.—G. P. Putnam's Sons have added to their "Advanced Science Series" the "Practical Plane Geometry and Projection" of Mr. Henry Angel, of London, a work intended to conduct the student through the higher departments of mathematical drawing. It presupposes some acquaintance with the elements of geometry and a knowledge of the proper use of drawing instruments. An octavo volume of 351 pages contains the text, admirably illustrated with a great number of figures. A second volume, 4to, contains 81 plates too large for an 8vo page. The range of the work is very extensive, covering the courses of the Royal Military Academy, the Royal School of Mines, and, speaking generally, of the schools of engineering and art, and the number of examples for practice is unusually large.—A. C. Armstrong & Son have issued another edition of Dr. Doran's comprehensive historic-biographical 'Monarchs Retired from Business,' in two volumes. A similar work on 'Presidents Retired from Business' would be apt to find a ready sale at this time.—The Messrs. Appleton publish, as a companion volume to 'American Painters,' a work of the same size, printed from English plates and copiously illustrated by English wood-engravers, called 'British Painters.' The text is anonymous, and apparently by different hands, and, like the illustrations, of ordinary quality but satisfactory as exposition. The work begins with Turner and Constable, and ends with Frederick Walker and Frank Holl.—Lee & Shepard issue in holiday dress 'Home, Sweet Home,' by John Howard Payne, illustrated with designs by Miss Humphreys, engraved by Andrew. They are in general prettily conceived, but occasionally executed with what, in the case of a less experienced designer, we should call ingenuousness.—The main attraction in the *American Art Review* for December is perhaps Mr. Cole's rendering of Wiertz's rather uninteresting "On se retrouve au ciel." The second paper on the Wiertz Museum at Brussels considers its fantastic contents temperately, with a wisdom which a print of "The Genius of War" plainly enough confirms. Mr. McLaughlin concludes his notes on artists of a Cincinnati origin, and a striking head engraved by Juengling after Strobridge deserves mention among its accompanying cuts. A reproduction of a portrait by Mr. Vinton may also be singled out from the remaining illustrations of the number as of special interest.—The Peabody Academy of Science, at Salem, announces that its *Memoirs* will be resumed at an early date, after a forced suspension for six years.—A memorial volume relating to the late Professor Benjamin Peirce will be published next month from the office of the *Harvard Register*. The *Register*, by the way, has an assured existence for another year. In the December number will be found biographical sketches, with portraits, of James Russell Lowell and Alexander Agassiz.—The current issue of the *Magazine of American History* contains miniature aquatint portraits of Governor George and Lady Clinton, from the original coppers of St. Mémin, a French artist who in the last century made a surprising number of crayon likenesses in this country, and was in the habit of "throwing in" with each one a reduced engraving. The *Magazine* now proposes to print from as many of these plates as are still preserved, and asks that they may be sent to the editorial rooms at No. 69 Bible House, New York.—A society for the encouragement and promotion of the study of Dante's works is in contemplation, and, if formed, Mr. Longfellow will accept the presidency. An annual assessment of five dollars will be the condition of membership. Some of the objects of the Society are "the obtaining a copy of Benvenuto da Imola's comment; the publication of a good collated comment on the 'Divina Commedia'; the translation into English of Dante's prose works," etc., etc. The secretary is Mr. John Woodbury, 2 Gray's, Cambridge.—Lectures on 'The Duties of Woman,' by Miss Frances Power Cobbe, will make a book to be published by George H. Ellis, Boston.—Drs. Fothergill and Wood's 'Food for the Invalid, the Convalescent, the Dyspeptic, and the Gouty' (Macmillan) meets a standing want. A concise introduction is followed by a goodly number of recipes which even the well may profit by.—The advance sheets of the forthcoming third volume of Von Holst's 'Constitutional History of the United States' have reached the American translator.—'Books and Reading for the Young,' a pamphlet reprint from a report of Mr. James H. Smart, Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Indiana, contains a number of lists of books fit for children by different hands, and otherwise will repay reading (Indianapolis).—Part XII. of Dr. Grove's 'Dictionary of Music and Musicians' (Macmillan) opens with Palestrina and ends with Plain Song. Passion Music and Piano-forte are the principal topics; Palestrina, Parepa-Rosa, Pasta, Patti, and Pergolesi the principal biographies.—Dr. Koolman's slow-moving 'Wörterbuch der Ostfriesischen Sprache' (Norden: Hermann Braams) is still, in its eleventh number, in the letter K.

—We called attention some months since to the incorporation of the New York Free Circulating Library, expressing the belief that notwithstand-

ing its small beginnings it was destined to render important aid in the enlightenment of the poorer classes of this city. The first annual report of the Society has now been published and it shows that the work done by it is steadily increasing. The number of books given out has risen from 1,653 in April to 4,212 in October and 5,335 in November. The number of applicants for books has also increased from 712 in March to 3,117 on the first of this month. This growth is natural and spontaneous; no efforts of any kind have been made to force the library upon the attention of the class upon which it relies for support, the managers preferring to have the demand for books itself determine the supply. The most remarkable discovery connected with the enterprise thus far has been the fact that the class inclined to make use of a circulating library of this kind in New York is entirely honest; only two volumes were lost between March 1 and November 1 out of 22,558 given out. The expenses have been kept down to the lowest possible limit; but it is found that about \$5,000 annually are needed for the purpose of maintaining it, and the managers are desirous that it should be placed upon a permanent basis. For this purpose the managers ask that contributions be sent to the Treasurer, Hon. L. P. Morton, at 25 Nassau Street. There ought to be no difficulty in raising a fund of \$100,000, or even a larger one, for this purpose. There are several reasons why an appeal from the managers of the Free Circulating Library should be received with more than ordinary consideration from persons able to contribute to the support of public objects of this sort. It is the only free circulating library in the city, all the others being restricted to certain limited classes, or not being free; it is in the hands of a very excellent board of managers, and from the very fact that it extends its sphere of operations only as the demand for books presses upon it, there can be no doubt that its continually increasing circulation amply proves the wisdom and necessity of its foundation. It is entirely non-sectarian and has no connection with or dependence upon city politics. Besides all this it has not been set on foot, as so many libraries and other institutions are, partly for a public object, and partly for the honor and glory of the founder; but its existence is solely due to the unselfish benevolence of managers who have nothing but the interest of the experiment to promote.

—A final clearance of the children's books on our table will be made when we have noticed Mrs. Laura E. Richards's 'Five Little Mice in a Mouse-Trap,' and Mr. Hezekiah Butterworth's 'Zig-Zag Journeys in Classic Lands,' both published by Estes & Lauriat, Boston; and Mr. John D. Champlin's 'Young Folks' Cyclopædia of Persons and Places,' published by Henry Holt & Co. The first is a voluble and slightly bewildering performance, utterly formless, and apparently made to fit the illustrations. We cannot congratulate the child who is set to read it. Equally defective in form is the 'Zig-Zag Journeys,' of which the intent is at least serious, and which contains a good deal of information and entertainment not remotely suggested by the full title. Who, for example, would expect to find "in classic lands" a negro story about a possum, or a homily on smuggling in Boston harbor, or instruction in legerdemain, or a comic translation of the Dido episode in the 'Æneid'? Mr. Butterworth threatens to go on, but there are still some corners of the earth which ought to be spared this treatment. Mr. Champlin's Cyclopædia is supplementary to the same compiler's useful 'Cyclopædia of Common Things,' which it considerably exceeds in bulk. In spite of its limitation to persons and places, it admits two historical titles—Seven Years' War and Thirty Years' War—and perhaps by way of compensation omits Westphalia. Like the companion volume, it is deficient in cross-references. The greatest number are from the tribal names to the general article on American Indians, but Mr. Champlin is not consistent. From Seven Pines we are referred to Chickahominy, but there is no Pittsburgh Landing with a reference to Shiloh. "George Sand, see Dudevant" calls for "George Eliot, see Evans," but in the latter case the pseudonym takes precedence. Cognizance is purposely taken of a certain number of writers of books for children, though so prolific a story-teller as the late W. H. G. Kingston is overlooked. The selection is almost equivalent to a literary judgment, and cannot be very highly approved. Some attention to educators might have been looked for under the circumstances, but no place was reserved for Horace Mann, S. G. Howe, Froebel, Pestalozzi, or even Locke, while Rousseau (whose career is wretchedly summed up) is dismissed without a word as to his epoch-making 'Émile.' There is an obvious endeavor to lay stress on the boyhood of celebrated persons, with, of course, not seldom a very disproportionate effect. Perhaps the worst instance is in the case of Dickens. On the other hand, Farragut's characteristic exploit on board the *Phæbe* in the harbor of Valparaíso, in 1814, is suffered to go to waste.

—The weakness of the American portion is hardest to excuse. The biographies of the Presidents are commonly very bald, without so much as the significant events of their administrations; for instance, Mr. Champlin is silent about Jackson's suppression of nullification. But again, to say, however truly, of Jackson that he was "one of the most popular of all our Presidents" is nearly equivalent to holding him up as an example. It is, of course, a nice question how far the professional neutrality of cyclopædists

should be departed from here, but it is remarkable how completely the reformers of the present century are ignored. Take the abolition agitation, for instance—not one of its prominent leaders is mentioned; nor is John Brown described for the benefit of the rising generation, anxious to learn why “his soul’s marching on.” Sumner is recognized, but not Josiah Quincy; and Caleb Cushing is likewise left out in the cold. Among orators Edward Everett and Wendell Phillips are both missing. Mrs. Stowe is favored above her father or any of her brothers. Mrs. Lydia Maria Child is passed over, perhaps to make room for Mrs. Harriet Prescott Spofford. Heredity is properly illustrated by admitting four generations of Adamsses, but Alexander Agassiz is not alluded to in connection with his distinguished father, though much inferior naturalists are remembered. Dr. F. V. Hayden is not offset by Clarence King or J. D. Whitney—to mention no others. Graham Bell is excluded, while Edison is credited with improvements of the telephone. Charlotte Cushman has the stage pretty much to herself, neither Forrest nor the Booths nor Joseph Jefferson being “called.” A singular liberality is shown towards artists, especially the living, but neither the sculptor Crawford nor the painter-engraver Durand has been retained in Mr. Champlin’s drag-net.

—The authorship of the article on “London Theatres” in the January *Scribner* is anonymous, and for that reason we withhold a conjecture in regard to it on which we should be willing to stake our reputation for discernment. The style is much above that in which theatrical gossip and criticism are generally clothed, and it would require a long residence in the British metropolis to acquire for one’s self half the information conveyed by this article. Mr. Mayhew’s “In Albania with the Ghegs” is unsubstantial in comparison with his previous paper on Montenegro, and does not proceed from a rich or profound experience. The second of the series called “Glimpses of Parisian Art,” on the contrary, maintains its interest, and is still abundantly illustrated autographically. The Life of Millet is concluded, being carried on from the point at which the late Alfred Sensier dropped it by Paul Mantz. As striking as anything in it is the sentence from a letter of 1863, in which the painter says: “The reading of Theocritus proves to me that one is never so Greek as in painting naively one’s own impressions, no matter where they were received; and Burns proves it also.” Millet had just begun to make the acquaintance of these two poets, the former of whom he undertook to translate. Dr. Charles Robinson’s “The Bible Society and the New Revision” opens up some interesting questions. For example: If the revised version of the New Testament is to be a monopoly of British manufacture, would it not be “nobly jealous” in our publishers and Bible and Tract Societies to deny the claim of “moral copyright” in this case; and would it not be “exceedingly foolish” in our cheap “libraries” not to “catch up the New Version the moment it is put in type”? To pave the way for the acceptance of the new version, “it has been deemed necessary to parade somewhat conspicuously the exigencies of the case” by making “a detailed exhibition of the blemishes in the King James Bible.” In the market contest between new and old, will these criticisms go on indefinitely, and provoke in retort a search for faults in the new version? The charter of the American Bible Society confines its distribution of Bibles to “the Version in common use.” Does this debar it (“moral copyright” apart) from manufacturing and circulating the revised version; and if so, can the charter be amended, or must there be a new Bible Society? Dr. Robinson rehearses with a good deal of feeling the causes of the withdrawal of the superficially amended Scriptures put forth by the Society in December, 1856, and the part which the Rev. A. C. Coxe and the late Dr. Hodge more especially had in bringing about a return to the time-honored “twenty-four thousand discrepancies,” a small portion of which had been rectified.

—As bearing on the review of Redfield’s ‘Homicide,’ which we print on another page, we subjoin the following extract from a private letter which accidentally reaches us at this time. The writer is a resident of Missouri:

“We generally agree with your conclusions, but not always. For instance, on page 386 you quote Mr. Lanier’s statement about his personal difficulties (which, by the way, we have seldom seen equalled for force and at the same time modesty of statement). Mr. Lanier may be a bad man—we are prepared to believe that he is, since the *Nation* says so; but the fact that a man has personal encounters by no means proves that he is either ‘turbulent’ or ‘quarrelsome,’ but in the South only proves that some one thinks he can get glory by an assault. Civilization is a different word in the South from what it is in the North. The writer, a little over ten years ago, in this very place, while ‘enjoying’ that scourge of the West, a felon, and almost sick as well as crippled, was set on by a bully in the presence of several men, some of them church members, and it was only by using the remaining fist to the best of his ability that he escaped a mauling, for not one of the bystanders said a word. This could scarcely have happened among reputable men in the North; but even piety in the South means something else than the Northern signification. It was my duty and pleasure to assist the bully latterly to bread as he slowly worked downwards, and finally brought up in the State prison.”

—The success of “Forget-Me-Not” at Wallack’s is mainly attributable to the interest of the plot and the acting of Miss Rose Coghlan. There is no change of scene in the three acts, and there are only four principal cha-

acters, for *Barrato*, the Corsican, has very little to say, while *Prince Malleotti* and *Mrs. Foley* are comic characters whose parts are very loosely connected with the main plot. This in itself is simple enough: *Stephanie*, Marquise de Mohrivart, is an adventuress who, with her husband, at one time kept a gambling hell in Paris, in which she acted the usual part of decoy. Her son, the *Vicomte de Brissac*, married *Rose Verney*, an English girl. By Article 148 of the French code this marriage was unlawful and its issue illegitimate, unless the consent of both parents was obtained within the year. At the time the action of the play begins but six weeks of this year remain. In the meantime the viscount has died, leaving his wife with a child but just born. *Stephanie* has never given her consent to the marriage of her son, and having formed the desire to make herself a respectable woman determines to do so by means of the hold this fact gives her upon the sister of *Rose Verney*. To this sister *Alice* she reveals the fact that she is the mother of the late viscount, and that without her consent his marriage is still null and void. She promises, however, to give her consent at the end of six weeks, if meantime she is received as a relative and given a proper position in society by the *Verneys*. Her character, it should be said, is so notorious that *Alice Verney* shrinks in horror at the mere thought of being in the same house with her. *Sir Horace Welby*, who is in love with *Alice* and at the same time an old acquaintance of *Stephanie*’s, is staying with the *Verneys* at Rome. He, of course, knows her history thoroughly and determines to get her out of the house. The main action of the play consists in the struggle between *Sir Horace* and *Stephanie*. *Barrato*, a Corsican, who had formerly been one of the many victims of the Mohrivart household, appears on the scene. He had, in revenge for his wrongs, murdered the marquis and very nearly succeeded in killing his wife, and had then been sentenced to the galleys; *Stephanie* well knows that her life is not worth a moment’s purchase if she is in the same city with him, and she is finally driven from the *Verneys*’ palace (having first signed her consent to the marriage of her dead son) under the influence of physical fear of this Corsican enemy. There is nothing very interesting about the character of *Stephanie* except her audacious wickedness. The career of a gambler’s female decoy can hardly, except in very exceptional circumstances, furnish any materials for genuine tragic interest, but Miss Coghlan gets all out of the part that there is to be got. Since her first appearance at Wallack’s she has never made so distinct a hit. The part is well written, and there is more opportunity for the display of her talents than the bare outline of the plot we have given may suggest, as in the scenes with *Sir Horace* and the prince she has a very wide range of either real or feigned emotions to represent. Her alternate pathetic appeals to and brazen defiance of *Alice*’s lover, her coquettish encouragement of the prince, struck us as showing more real variety of talent than Miss Coghlan has ever before given proof of possessing. Miss Boniface is hardly equal to the part of *Alice Verney*, who occupies the really tragic position in the play, and Mr. Tearle does not make his *Sir Horace* as good a part as the authors of the play gave him a chance to do. The dialogue has the brightness which always characterizes the plays in which Mr. Merivale has a hand. There is perhaps a little too much of the melodrama in the Carmelite chorus, the sudden appearance of *Barrato*, and the escape of *Stephanie* in the last act; but in the great feat of sustaining the interest to the end the authors have succeeded admirably.

—It is gratifying to learn from high authority that, despite the contrary assurances of those who are disposed to look upon Franklin’s experiments as mere “scientific diversions,” the lightning-rod may still be considered as of essential service in protecting life and property from electric destruction; and no less comforting is it to know that the space protected by a given rod may be accurately determined through direct mathematical computation. In a paper communicated to the London and Edinburgh *Philosophical Magazine* (Dec., 1880), Mr. W. H. Preece, Electrician to the General Post-Office, London, than whom there is probably no higher authority living in the field of electric and telegraphic engineering, demonstrates this protected space to be in the form of a cone, whose height is equal to the length of the rod, and whose base is a circle, the radius of which is also equal to the length of the rod in question. The side of this conic space “is the quadrant of a circle whose radius is equal to the height of the rod.” These results, obtained from mathematical and physical data, appear to find striking confirmation in the known facts elicited through direct investigation, for, as Mr. Preece informs us, in all the test cases that came under his own immediate observation the accident invariably took place in a region exterior to the conic space:

“I have carefully examined every record of accident that I could examine, and I have not yet found one case where damage was inflicted inside this cone when the building was properly protected. There are many cases where the pinnacles of the same turret of a church have been struck where one has had a rod attached to it; but it is clear that the other pinnacles were outside the cone; and, therefore, for protection each pinnacle should have had its own rod. It is evident also that every prominent point of a building should have its rod, and that the higher the rod the greater is the space protected.”

—It is not widely known, perhaps, that the first impersonator of *Mephistopheles* at Weimar is still among the living, and, at the age of eighty-six, one

of the brightest ornaments of the famous Burgtheater of Vienna. Karl La Roche came to Weimar in 1822, and remained there until the death of Goethe, under whose influence and guidance he established his fame as an actor. The story of the first performance of "Faust" at Weimar and La Roche's share in it is now graphically and authentically told by K. I. Schröder in his 'Faust von Goethe, mit Einleitung und fortlaufender Erklärung' (Heilbronn: Gebrüder Henninger), La Roche having thrown doubts on many of the statements contained in an older publication on the same subject—Enslin's 'Die erste Theater-Vorstellung des Goethe'schen Faust.' Goethe's aversion to the representation of his "Faust" on the stage was well known and for many years respected. In the winter of 1828-29, however, Von Müller, Riemer, Eckermann, and La Roche—probably on learning that Brunswick contemplated a performance of "Faust"—resolved on its representation at Weimar. When they called on Goethe to acquaint him with their project, and Herr von Müller unguardedly used the expression "we have determined," Goethe flew into a passion and indignantly exclaimed: "Do you think that if I had been willing to see 'Faust' on the stage I could not have had it performed myself? Is it right to dispose of my works without knowing my intentions?" etc., etc. However, he gradually relented, chiefly through the interposition of his daughter-in-law, to whom he said, "Well, let it at least be performed as I want to have it, and not as they think proper." Accordingly he invited the members of the theatre and some friends to his house, and read to them the entire first part of the tragedy. La Roche still speaks of the overpowering effect produced by the incomparable voice of the reader. He read the part of *Faust* in a bass voice, changing into the most sonorous tenor after the rejuvenating draught. La Roche studied subsequently the part of *Mephistopheles* under Goethe's direction, who instructed him in every detail and weighed every word. The performance finally took place on the 29th of August, 1829. Goethe, however, did not attend it. Not the least interesting feature of the connection between Goethe and La Roche is the latter's personal resemblance to the poet in his old age.

—The Brahmo Somaj, the theistic church in India, has excited considerable interest by its emancipation from the polytheistic beliefs prevalent in India, and also, though in a less degree, by its opposition to some native customs—caste, for instance, and the subjection of women. Though theistic at its foundation in 1830, by Rammohun Roy, on the basis of the assumed infallibility of the Vedas, under Keshub Chunder Sen the exclusive use of the Vedas was given up and a liturgical service from the books of various religions adopted. But Roy's successor, Debendra Nath Tagore, objected to any attempt to abolish caste, and when Sen, though a Brahmin, after celebrating a marriage between a Brahmin and one of another caste, joined the feast at which the married parties ate, and women were also present, there arose a breach in the society, and in 1865 a new organization was formed—the Brahmo Somaj of India, of which Sen became the leader. The old society was called the Adi Somaj. The new movement, unfortunately, took a turn towards mysticism instead of practical work, and though, like the old, it rejected all mediators between man and the Supreme Being, it has lately begun to use such devotional and ecstatic expressions towards the Deity as members of some Christian sects apply to Christ as the second person of the Trinity. So far, under Sen's leadership, did this proceed that the philosophical and literary studies of the sect, as well as the institutions for social reform, began to be neglected in behalf of the contemplative life, after the manner, on a small scale, of the mystics and the hermits. In 1877 the Brahmo Niketan, a sort of boarding-school for young Brahmins, was closed, and a few months later the normal-school for girls had the Government subsidy withdrawn on account of lack of attendance.

—In 1878 an event occurred which caused a new division in the society. Sen had been one of the principal workers for the Indian Marriage Act of 1872, which was passed expressly for this organization in order to legalize marriage by their rites, Anglo-Indian law having previously recognized only marriages according to the ritual of the older religious bodies of the country. By this act the legal age of men was fixed at eighteen and of women at fourteen. It was now (in 1878) announced that Sen's daughter was to be married to the Rajah of Couch Behar; the rajah was fifteen years old, Sen's daughter thirteen. The marriage was, in fact, performed, Sen's conclusive reason for his assent, though overriding principles and rules which he had advocated, being the rajah's assurance that, if the marriage did not take place at once, it must be postponed till after his return from England. The details of this episode in the Brahmo Somaj, and also the general history of the sect, may be found in an article in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* for September 15, by the Count Goblet d'Alviella. Remonstrances against Sen's conduct in the affair came up from all India. Resolutions were adopted at a meeting in Calcutta of three thousand Brahmoists declaring that he had forfeited the confidence of the Church, and demanding that he resign his secretaryship. A new organization resulted from this revolt against his authority, the Sadharan Somaj, or Universal Union or Society. The three divisions of the sect are all

in existence. The creed of the new organization denounces inspired prophets and mediators between the believer and the Deity, and is aimed at Sen's pretension, which he has put forward of late years, to be *adesh* (inspired). He defended his conduct in regard to his daughter's marriage on the ground of a special inspiration. Sen appears to have removed somewhat from his position at the time of his visit to England in 1870, when he declared that, "If purity, truth, chastity, renunciation, self-denial are Christian virtues, then wherever they are found Christianity is present, whether they appear in Christian, Hindoo, or Mohammedan." Although this relapse of the reformer into native customs for the sake of a desirable match appears to us Westerners unwise and cruel, and is to be deplored, yet the agitation on the subject throughout India seems to show that the native unchristian usages are in a state of disintegration as well as the old polytheistic doctrines. Monier Williams, the Sanskrit professor at Oxford, said ten years ago that in the matter of religious belief all India is in much the condition of the Roman world at the time of the dawn of Christianity. Whether Christianity as a religious system is likely to acquire much of a hold in India is perhaps doubtful. A German deacon has called the Brahmo Somaj "a limit to missionary activity," and it appears to be certain that the stricter Christian sects entertain no theological doctrine that India has not already held in vital counterpart.

—An important branch of German mediæval literature has recently been treated at length by R. Cruel in his 'History of German Preaching during the Middle Ages' ('Geschichte der deutschen Predigt im Mittelalter.' Detmold. 1879). He divides his subject into two periods. The first, extending from 600 to 1200, is marked by the unoriginal and unorganic character of the sermon, which borrowed its materials from the earlier collections, and, except the double classification into homilies and sermons (the former mere explanation of the text, the latter the treatment of some abstract subject with or without a text), offers no systematic arrangement of topics. The sermon of the second period, reaching to the Reformation, is distinguished by originality of contents and logical disposition of materials. The first part of the work treats of the missionary (600-900), the episcopal (900-1100), and the parochial (1100-1200) sermon, with a special chapter on the delivery of the sermon, liturgy, and singing in the German language, addresses at festivals and funerals, homiletic aids, and the condition of the clergy during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The chief sources of the sermon during this period were the collections of Latin and German sermons, which the author examines at length; besides these, examples or anecdotes were furnished by the popular 'Vitæ Patrum,' the 'Dialogue' of Gregory the Great, the 'Dialogus Miraculorum' of Cæsar of Heisterbach, and the 'Physiologus,' one of the oldest *Bestiaires*. The second period is marked, of course, by greater individuality, and contains such well-known names as Berthold of Ratisbon, Albertus Magnus, Dr. Tauler, Geiler of Kaisersberg, etc. The third chapter contains an interesting account of the sermon-books of the fifteenth century, which are valuable for the *Culturgeschichte* of the period, and also to the student of comparative storiology, as throwing a flood of light upon the mode of diffusion of mediæval tales. The most valuable single conclusion arrived at by the author is that "the language of the public sermon in Germany from the beginning and at all times was German." The mass of interesting anecdotes and citations from rare sources will incline the scholar to overlook the author's lack of a strictly scientific method, especially as one is informed in the preface that the present work is intended only to pave the way for a more complete treatment of the subject.

DUFFY'S YOUNG IRELAND.*

TO those who remember the career of the author of this book previous to 1850, and have heard little or nothing of him since, his appearance on the title-page as Sir Charles Gavan Duffy, a knight of the British Order of St. Michael and St. George, will seem one of the oddest of transformations. Between 1840 and 1850 he was one of the most prominent and most formidable enemies of English rule in his own country. In 1848 he fell, with many of his coadjutors, into the clutches of the law, and was tried for "treason-felony," but acquitted. After his liberation he tried politics once more as a member of the British Parliament, but had the good sense to see that that was not an arena in which a man of his antecedents could hope to accomplish much either for his own fame or his country's good. So he emigrated to the colony of Victoria, in Australia, and threw himself into political life there with such success that he was for some time Prime Minister, and only this year resigned the Speakership of the Parliament in order to come to England to superintend the publication of his book. What is most remarkable in his colonial career is that, though it lay among Englishmen mainly, and though he began it with the taint of being an "ex-rebel" resting on him, and though he never for one moment professed anything like repentance, he secured the confidence and esteem of both colleagues and competitors, and received the highest honors with which the Crown recognizes colonial eminence. Duffy

* 'Young Ireland: A Fragment of Irish History, 1840-1850. By Sir Charles Gavan Duffy K.C.M.G.' New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1880.

his absence Ireland has undergone much change. Concessions, such as the disestablishment of the Protestant Church and the ballot, which were in O'Connell's day scouted as wildly impracticable, have been made. The population has much diminished, but what there is is much more comfortable and prosperous. The English conscience, or at least the conscience of the English Liberals, has become far more sensitive about Irish grievances than it was in his day. Coercion is not so lightly talked of, much less resorted to, by Englishmen as a means of meeting Irish discontent. A new element, too, and a very serious one, has appeared in the Irish problem, in the shape of Irish-American sympathy. The sympathy of native Americans with Irish political aspirations is, it must be confessed, gone or greatly reduced in strength, but it is for all practical purposes more than compensated for by that of the two millions of Irish who now live on American soil, and are prosperous enough to aid their friends at home with money as well as with instigation to revolt. Sir Charles Duffy, however, does not find in these things reason for regretting anything he ever said, or regretting anything he ever did, as an Irish agitator, although, as he explains in his preface, "a larger experience of mankind, the responsibilities of public office, and leisure for reflection, have, he trusts, enabled him to scrutinize them [the events which he has undertaken to record] from a new point of view, and to revise whatever was rash or ungenerous in earlier judgments." In fact, although long absence from the country may incapacitate him for forming a correct judgment on the actual situation in Ireland, it probably has done much to strengthen his authority as an exponent of the causes which, apart from the land question, make Irish hostility to English rule so deep and bitter and lasting.

He could hardly have thrown his exposition into a better shape than the history of the "Young Ireland" movement between 1840 and 1850. It and the Volunteer movement of 1782, which resulted in securing the independence of the Irish Parliament, are the only two episodes in Irish history which can really be called brilliant, and which contained the seeds of real political promise. The former was, however, simply the victory of the Protestant colony over the mother country; the conquered Catholic sons of the soil had no share in it. The Young Ireland movement was, on the other hand, thoroughly national. It was the first sincere and able attempt made on Irish soil to dissociate politics from religion, and, to use Chief Baron Wolfe's words, which formed the motto of Duffy's paper, the *Nation*, "to create and foster public opinion in Ireland, and make it racy of the soil"; to find in Irish history some materials for healthy national pride; and to support the movement for the restoration of Irish legislative independence by such a display of Irish political capacity as mere journalism would permit.

It has been ever since 1848 the common opinion that the Young Ireland movement was due to a revolt of the young men of the repeal party against O'Connell's policy of peace and moral suasion, and that the disastrous result furnished a fresh proof of his wisdom and moderation. Sir Charles Duffy produces ample proof that this is a mistake; that O'Connell was himself committed to physical force in the last resort, before the projected Clontarf meeting and his trial, and that the Young Irelanders simply carried out a programme for which failing health and courage, and divers defects of character, left him no heart. In fact, the account of O'Connell's faltering is one of the most interesting and instructive portions of the book, and there seems to be little doubt that he, before the impairment of his powers, was just as well satisfied as the Young Irelanders were then, and as the Land Leaguers apparently are now, that Irish agitation, as long as it contains no threat of violence, produces no effect on English opinion. That they by no means ignored the land question is shown by the following remarkable passage from a manifesto of principles published in Duffy's *Nation*, now more than twenty-five years ago. The prediction with which it concludes is, in view of what is now occurring in Ireland, very striking:

"On the Tenure Question our course has been an open and decided one.

"We seek to secure to the peasant land at a just rent.

"A just rent would leave him comfort and some leisure.

"We seek for him the value of all the labor or money he spends in improvements.

"And we seek prospective laws, which shall tend, by a natural and easy change, to reduce the great estates and create a body of small proprietors in fee throughout every part of Ireland.

"But we are not ready to jump into a servile war for this purpose.

"On the contrary, we shall do our best to make the landlords recognize that the postponement of the tenure settlement, or the decline of the political agitation, would lead to an anti rent movement, which might end in a disastrous rebellion, but would begin by reducing them to beggary, and could not be quelled by the defeat of insurgent armies."

The Young Ireland movement was essentially, as its name indicates, a movement of young men. Few if any of those who started it were over thirty, and they began and carried it on mainly through the *Nation* newspaper, which Duffy founded in 1842, and edited until its suppression after the rising in 1848. They were men of both races and belonged to both creeds; and there is nothing more remarkable in the history of journalism than the versatility, the fire, and the force which they brought to their work and the tenacity with which

they maintained such excellence as it possessed. It was the first Irish newspaper on that side of politics which made a distinct impression outside Ireland. English Conservatives acknowledged from the start that it was the most dangerous weapon with which English supremacy had ever been assailed in the field of either oratory or literature. Nor did the members confine themselves to newspaper work. A "Library of Ireland," consisting of a series of small volumes devoted to Irish biography and the elucidation of Irish history, was also issued by them and had a great circulation, ten or eleven volumes in all appearing before 1848. They worked the poetic vein, too, with considerable success, and a collection of the songs and ballads which had appeared in the *Nation* was very respectfully treated even by hostile English critics. The most remarkable man of the group was undoubtedly Thomas Davis, a young Protestant barrister, who was one of Duffy's coadjutors in establishing the paper, and we believe first tried his hand at writing in its columns at the age of twenty-eight. His contributions, both in prose and verse, during the ensuing three years were not only full of great promise, but had a power and brilliancy which probably did more than anything else to give weight and fame to the movement, and to command respect for it both in England and Ireland. He died in 1845 at the age of thirty-three, and there is in his literary remains plenty of evidence to support the belief that Sir Charles Duffy's tribute to his memory is not extravagant when he says:

"Judging him now, a generation after his death, when years and communion with the world have tempered the exaggerations of youthful friendship, I can confidently say that I have never known a man so nobly gifted as Thomas Davis. If his articles had been spoken speeches his reputation as an orator would have rivalled Grattan's, and the beauty and vigor of his style were never employed for show, as they sometimes were by Grattan; he fired not rockets but salvos of artillery. If his programmes and reports, which were the plans and specifications of much of the best work done in his day, had been habitually associated with his name, his practical skill would have ranked as high as O'Connell's. . . . He was singularly modest and unselfish, but the phrases employed to express modesty and unselfishness are weak and absurd when applied to him. In a long life I have never known any man remotely resemble him in these qualities. The chief motive power of a party and a cause, laboring for them as a man of exemplary industry labors in his calling, he not only never claimed any recognition or reward, but discouraged allusion to his services by those who knew them best. Passionate enthusiasm is apt to become prejudice, but in Davis it was controlled not only by a disciplined judgment, but by a fixed determination to be just. He brought to a political controversy a fairness unexampled in Ireland. In all his writings there will not be found a single sentence reflecting ungenerously on any human being. He had set himself the task of building up a nation, a task not beyond his strength had fortune been kind."

The Young Ireland movement came to an untimely end in 1848, through causes which are still operative in Irish politics. O'Connell was openly hostile to it as a sort of revolt against his authority, but this would not have injured it seriously if he and his following had not managed to bring it into disrepute as an organization of infidels. In 1846 the priests were arrayed against it as hostile to religion, so that its hold on the popular mind was seriously weakened before the final outbreak. The news of the success of the French Revolution in 1848 precipitated the attempt at revolt which ended so ludicrously in the cabbage-garden at Ballinacorney. It was called for in the *Nation* by an announcement that "Ireland's opportunity, thank God and France, at last has come." The defeat of the troops in the streets of Paris by the mob had evidently turned the heads of the Irish leaders, and blinded them to the real nature of the military problem which any Irish insurrection involves. They had neither officers, arms, organization, money, commissariat, nor a general. Any one who looks in Duffy's book for an explanation or palliation of the immense folly of the appeal to arms will be disappointed. In fact, the sanity and clearheadedness which he shows only deepen the mystery which surrounds the events of 1848. That so rational a man should have been mixed up in such a harum-scarum adventure seems now incomprehensible. But his tale is, nevertheless, not only both graceful and touching, but full of instruction regarding the existing situation in Ireland, and is told in a style of remarkable simplicity and clearness.

HOMICIDE, NORTH AND SOUTH.*

MORE men have fallen in personal combat at the South since 1840 than were killed in battle on both sides in the rebellion (p. 120); in the same section there have been more homicides since the war than there have been deaths from yellow fever (p. 106)—this number is at least 40,000 (p. 10). In Texas there were more assassinations in 1878 than homicides of all kinds in Massachusetts in 1877-78 (p. 64), and always there are more manslaughterers at large than in confinement (p. 77). In South Carolina there were three duels in 1878, against none among the more than thirty millions of the Northern population (p. 90); and of a single affray in Edgefield, which "leads us into accounts of seven different homicides," all the survivors were acquitted on

* Homicide, North and South. Being a comparative view of crime against the person in several parts of the United States. By H. V. Redfield. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1880. 12mo, pp. 207.

trial (p. 91). The number of homicides along the route of the Cincinnati Southern Railway from Cincinnati to Chattanooga, "during its construction through Kentucky and Tennessee, I believe to be equal to half the length of the road measured in miles—that is, for every two miles of road there was a man murdered in the vicinity of the line" (p. 167). The population of the three sample Southern States—Texas, Kentucky, and South Carolina—is less than that of New England by half a million, but the homicides are eighteen times as numerous (p. 15); there are often more in Kentucky in a month than in Massachusetts in a year, and as many in South Carolina in two as in Massachusetts in ten years (pp. 14, 18), though the Northern State has much the larger population in each case. In Massachusetts, the ratio of killing has decreased with the increase of population—ten per cent. against eighteen per cent. in 1869-78 (p. 154); in South Carolina, crimes against the person show no diminution under Hampton as compared with those committed under Chamberlain and Scott (p. 105). In Mississippi, according to the *Vicksburg Herald* of May 25, 1879, there is an average of a murder a day (p. 152). At the South the highest ratio of homicide is in the country, at the North in the cities (p. 31). The foreign element forms less than two per cent. of the population at the South (p. 15), and in Mississippi, for example, "so far from the foreigners being the cause of so much murder, it is more probable that so much murder accounts for there being so few foreigners" (p. 153).

Such are some of the multifarious forms in which Mr. Redfield strikingly illustrates the difference, as regards the sacredness of human life, between the South and not only the North but any civilized country on the face of the globe. His work, though systematic in its way, is still an endless variation of one theme. If he treats of Ohio by itself, the conclusion is: "Draw a line through the State, east and west, so as to divide population equally, and a very much larger number of homicides will be found south of this line than north of it"; while "the very lowest per cent. of homicide to population is found where those who have investigated such subjects would expect to find it—in the agricultural counties of the Western Reserve, settled very largely, in fact, almost entirely, from New England and New York." If Indiana and Illinois are under discussion, it appears that in the former State, "in 1878, there were eighty-four prisoners in the Southern prison charged with murder and manslaughter, and but forty-nine in the Northern," these two penitentiaries being recruited from nearly equal divisions of the population; and that Illinois shows a similar excess of bloodiness in the counties bordering on Kentucky and largely settled from the South. In short, this conscientious study of a great social evil, based almost without exception for the North (because it was possible) upon official records, and without exception for the South (because there was no alternative) upon unofficial records in the newspapers—often in a single newspaper in a State—and therefore necessarily defective, involves such a contrast between the two sections as to suggest the enquiry (p. 19), "Have we not here two civilizations?"

Now, nothing is more noticeable in any discussion, however moderate, of the feelings which the North does actually or ought to entertain towards the South, than the offence taken by Southern writers at the assumption that there are two civilizations in this country, and that the higher exists at the North. It is a part of the disease which Mr. Redfield seeks to eradicate by exposing it in its hideous deformity, that representative Southerners fail to see in the spirit of violence which gives the tone to their section an essential distinction, to which Northerners have a right to point deprecatingly on the one hand and with justifiable self-righteousness on the other. And yet—

"There is nothing that so distinguishes the Southern civilization from the Northern as this one matter of homicide. Murder there is everywhere, but the fact that it is so very much more frequent in the Southern States than elsewhere should put the Southern people upon enquiry as to the cause and the remedy. To do this is the object of the book."

It is no longer an abolitionist who speaks these words, but one closely acquainted and allied with the Southern people, who has words of admiration for many of their qualities, and whose sincerity is attested on every page. No political motive whatever inspired this laborious investigation, which was prompted by an unusually wide experience and a philanthropic and patriotic desire to wipe away what is something more than a sectional stain. The fairness of Mr. Redfield's statistics, estimated as they too often have to be, will not be questioned by anybody. The least skilful part of this tract, if we may so call it, is its discussion of the cause of the Southern evil—in fact, formally there is no such discussion. The nearest approach to it is the final chapter, on carrying concealed weapons, as to which Judge Guild, of Tennessee, is quoted as saying, "More than half the homicides which occur grow out of this debased practice," and the author himself asserts that seven-eighths of the homicides in South Carolina grow out of it. It is therefore clear that the effective suppression of this practice would do more than anything else to assimilate the Northern to the Southern civilization. But why is it not attempted? Is it because the black population is dangerous and threatening? On the contrary, Mr. Redfield shows that in Texas, South Carolina, and Kentucky, in 1878,

434	whites	were	killed	by	whites,
16	"	"	"	"	blacks,
109	blacks	"	"	"	whites,
98	"	"	"	"	blacks.

And while there is no adequate punishment for white killing of blacks, there is a surety that either by court or by mob the black murderer will meet his reward. It is, however, but a short time since society in the South rested upon a war basis—for that is the constitution of every slaveholding community; and if it was only exceptionally, after some Nat Turner rising, that, as Mr. Broadnax said in the Virginia House of Delegates, men would "lock their doors at night and open them in the morning, to receive their servants to light their fires, with pistols in their hands," this was but the open manifestation of a perfectly normal relation between master and slave. Out of this grew inevitably the "code of honor" among the ruling class and lynch law among the mob of poor whites; hence the resort to the pistol or the knife in "personal difficulties," the most prolific source of life-taking, and hence the absolute indulgence of public sentiment for any standard of "self-defence."

"There are very many instances in the Southern courts where men are acquitted of manslaughter when their only justification was a blow from a cane or even the fist. Indeed, in some instances this is carried to the extent of acquitting for murder when the murderer killed his enemy in revenge for an insult by words, and when he was in no bodily peril whatever."

Mr. Redfield continues (p. 160):

"One wonders why murderers are so often acquitted by juries in Mississippi. Not many years ago, in one of the counties of that State, a murderer was being tried. An ex-sheriff of the county told me that the defendant would be acquitted. He spoke with confidence. I asked why. He replied that he was acquainted personally with every man on the jury, and that a majority of them had been engaged in what he called 'killing scrapes' themselves. Having been sheriff of the county he was personally cognizant of each case."

Any general and successful movement at the South to put down the carrying of concealed weapons would mark the first voluntary act in condemnation of the moral code which sheltered slavery. Before that comes about there is perhaps more hope for a subordinate but by no means trifling reformation intimately related to the subject under review.

"Probably one-half of the homicides in the Southern States," says Mr. Redfield, "are to be attributed directly or indirectly to whiskey. One who has lived long in the rural districts South, and having previously been acquainted with communities where there was less disorder, enabling him to draw comparisons, could hardly fail to be impressed with the prevalence of whiskey-drinking and the frequency of fighting with deadly weapons. . . . Often these deadly difficulties arise from very trifling causes, and parties are drawn in to help their friends who had nothing to do with the beginning of the affray. Originating in whiskey, they usually end in blood."

Pending the beneficent operation at the South of the American Peace and National Temperance Societies, we shall watch with interest the reception given to Mr. Redfield's book in that quarter. Will the Southern press quote largely from it? Will it praise or will it controvert and condemn it? Whatever may come of it, his appeal is one for which every Southern family, already bereaved by homicide or liable to be at any moment, ought to be profoundly grateful to him.

MISS BIRD'S JAPAN.*

THE beaten tracks in Japan have been well travelled by women as well as men during the last decade. Miss Weppner, Miss Gordon Cumming, Mrs. Ayerton, Mrs. Carrothers, have told the story of their rambles in books or periodicals. Many other foreign ladies, guiltless of the pen, have made themselves familiar with the highroads; and honeymoons spent on Fusi-yama are not unknown. Miss Bird, however, resolutely sought the sequestered vales and bridle-paths, and in every case chose the worst of two roads. She went out in quest of an unhackneyed view, and found it. Her method of studying Japan reminds us of the American tourist who, tired of hearing of Britain's glory, went to London, and visited only the slums and Billingsgate market. Miss Bird did indeed see Tokio and Kioto, and travelled famous highroads, but the letters which treat of the most charming portions of the Mikado's domains are suppressed, as they relate to her pet aversion—"beaten tracks." A score or two of Americans, if not more, may be disposed to quarrel with the title which the English lady has given to her book. It reads like a challenge. Several American ladies and many gentlemen have traversed the major part of Miss Bird's journey. Still, in gross and in detail, no foreigner of her own sex has preceded Miss Bird on her route.

This lady on horseback is a skilled traveller. She spent 'Six Months in the Sandwich Islands,' and has told from experience 'A Lady's Life in the Rocky Mountains.' She is an excellent observer, and her wide and accurate knowledge of botany and natural history, as well as of people, gives her an

* 'Unbeaten Tracks in Japan. By Isabella Bird.' New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1880. Two vols. 8vo.

unusual sweep of view and freshness of style. As a woman, too, she notices many particulars that escape a man's eye. The evidences of culture are seen on every page of her narrative, and her accuracy has the quality of a sweet perfume. It is a positive pleasure to find the names of places and things spelled correctly, even when repeated several times. By this mark of care words otherwise uncouth and empty of suggestion soon become full of individuality, and stimulate and refresh the memory instead of jading it. Her itineraries are carefully made out, and will bear verification from native maps. Her statements are almost invariably trustworthy as they stand, though others supplementary might be added with advantage. Added to this, she has read her proofs conscientiously, so that printers' mistakes are creditably few. One funny oversight, however, occurs on page 201, vol. ii., by which one might suppose that the favorite iris-gardens of the capital received their name from the old punctilious code of suicide, instead of artificial excavation: Hari-kiri should be Hori-kiri. Miss Bird also clings to the spelling Tōkiyō for the simpler Tōkiō, even to mangling the name of the sprightly but now defunct *Tokio Times*, conducted by an American journalist of some reputation.

The style of the book leads one to suppose that the author actually saw the most of what she writes about, during the six months spent by her in Japan, and that what she records is the fruit of her observation. This, however, is not the fact. The indefatigable lady did, indeed, accomplish a prodigious amount of sight-seeing and reflection during her stay of half a year; but her method does not differ from that of the German father of books on Japan. Engelbert Kaempfer is popularly supposed to have acquired his amazing knowledge of the Japanese and their country by direct personal investigation. In reality, the manuscript of Camphay, the superintendent of the Dutch factory at Nagasaki, which was given to Kaempfer to bring home, furnished the famous author with most of his material. So Miss Bird has plucked her grapes liberally from various vines, not always labelled, though the wine and its flavor are her own. We do not think that her account of the great temple at Asakusa, of household superstitions, of children's plays, of proverbs or of woman's studies could have been presented in the form she gives them without well-remembered, but usually unacknowledged, reading of a well-known work on Japan, written by an American.

Miss Bird first caught a glimpse of Japan's supreme landmark, Fusi-yama, on the 20th of May, 1878. She gives an impossible sketch of the peak (or is it an old cut?) such as is not seen in any of Hokusai's 'One Hundred Views of Fusi,' and states its height to be 13,080 feet. The average of two weeks' observation on the summit by Herr Knipping proves the height to be 12,235 feet. After a short rest in Yokohama, she goes to the capital, called, by "the pathetic conservatism of the British Legation, 'Yedo,'" but by the Japanese Government and people, since 1868, "Tokio." As a rule, Miss Bird prefers the more euphonious native names of things to the hybrid Chino-Japanese terms of the pedants who affect the purer archaic Chinese pronunciation, e. g. "Tokei"—to the mystification of Americans, who wonder whether Jeddo, Veddo, Yedo, Tokio, Tokiyo, are all one place, or parts of a place. For jin-rika-sha she substitutes *kuruma*; that is, a "wheel" for a "man-power carriage." We are sceptical in regard to her statement that the eighteen-mile railway between the port and the capital "earns \$8,000,000 a year."

From first to last Miss Bird freely vents her conviction that the Japanese are a degenerate race, possessed of a miserably poor physique. She calls the men "manikins," and ridicules their concave chests, bow-legs, and lack of complexion. The women's faces have an inane, vacant expression, with an obvious lack of soul.

"Physically, they look below par, as if the race was wearing out. . . . They look as if a girl passed from girlhood to middle age almost at once, when weighted with the cares of maternity. . . . The men don't look much better. They impress me as the ugliest and the most pleasing people I have ever seen, as well as the neatest and most ingenious" (p. 79, vol. i.)

"After the yellow skins, the stiff horse hair, the feeble eyelids, the elongated eyes, the sloping eyebrows, the flat noses, the sunken chests, the Mongolian features, the puny physique, the shaky walk of the men, the restricted totter of the women, and the general impression of degeneracy conveyed by the appearance of the Japanese, the Ainos make a singular impression" (p. 75, vol. ii.)

Old Japan, with its picturesque glories and horrors, exists now only on the boards of the theatre, and a rather sarcastic account is given of the "Reformed Theatre," in which the actors make their bow in a travestied "evening dress," with tight boots, white kid gloves, and black clothes supposed to fit. In the capital, old Yedo is represented by the grandeur of the castle walls, banks, moats, and esplanades. Even these are kept linked in association with the old régime by an occasional assassination of a cabinet minister. Tokio is architecturally represented by the public buildings in debased Europeanized style, noted chiefly for their superabundance of oblong glass windows. Glass, however, was a great curiosity two decades ago. From Tokio Miss Bird sets out to Nikko by the meaner of two roads, and thence, after studying the art lavished on the mausoleum and shrines of Iyeyasu, she leaves comfort behind and strikes across the island to Niigata. Her entire outfit is

limited to one hundred and ten pounds. Her only companion, interpreter and guide, is Ito, a characteristic specimen of modern young Japan. This youth hates Christianity, loathes the missionaries, eagerly learns English, affects to despise foreigners, is a radical when away from officials and a cringing slave in their presence, is not an inborn liar because he has no instinct of truth, is a polished gentleman in his manners and an unscrupled savage at heart. Under the eye and will of the English spinster lady he serves faithfully for twelve dollars a month, having already broken faith with and deserted another master who paid him but seven.

Our traveller's opinions of the native horse are severe, and her constant inveighings against its moral character are rather monotonous. She herself was obliged to force open the mouths of the sorry brutes, because "no Japanese horse ever opens his mouth except to eat or bite." She describes his three only movements—a drag, a roll, and a scramble. Travelling in summer, she beholds a vast and startling area of human cuticle; for in hot weather the women strip to their waists and the costume of the men consists mainly of a long handkerchief knotted round the body from front to rear. The villagers were all agog to see the stranger, and she ate her staple diet of boiled rice and eggs under the concentrated glare of eighteen pair of black eyes. Privacy is next to unknown in a Japanese house, and the lone lady discovered an eye at every crack and hole of the paper partitions of the yadaya. Her minute accounts of the smells, the discomforts, the fleas, the general meanness and vileness of the inns and villages of the Tsu River valley are tediously realistic. Miss Bird's journal in some respects reads strangely like the mediæval *Nikki* (diaries) of the Kioto noble travellers of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. These native authors poured contempt on "the boors of the East" and North, considering Japan above the thirty-sixth parallel as purgatory, and Kioto as heaven in comparison. Nevertheless she notices the redeeming features of modern Japan—the hospitals, equipped in scientific style, the silk-filatures having improved machinery, the public schools and educational conventions, and the missionary work at Niigata; and though her narrative abounds in condemnation of the vices of heathenism, she emphasizes the fact that the national reform proceeds *from within*.

The contents of volume second, which open with her arrival in Yezo, are, in our estimation, much more valuable than those of the first. Her tracks are here less unbeaten and her matter less strange to print. Her account of the Ainos is by far the most detailed, systematic, and readable yet written. She actually installed herself in an over-inhabited Aino hut for several days, questioning and taking notes. These irreclaimable savages are rude, dull, dirty, fond of drink, but well-formed, Caucasian in feature, not over-hirsute in body, as is popularly believed, and exceedingly gentle in manners. Nothing, however, in her observations goes to disprove the possibility that the Ainos were formerly the aborigines of northern Japan. She visited the shrine of Yoshitsuné, whom the Ainos have deified, but is not, as she supposes, the first European who has done so. She does not mention the theory, first propounded by Mr. E. H. House and elaborately investigated by Mr. Suyematsu, which makes it highly probable that the great conqueror Genghis Khan was none other than the Japanese hero Yoshitsuné.

Chapters on Kobe and Kioto, with favorable notices of the Christian missions at these places, a chapter on public affairs, and a not irreproachable index conclude this itinerary—for Miss Bird objects to its being classed as "a book on Japan." As a traveller's diary, then, it is vastly superior to, while fully as entertaining as, Hübner's sparkling narrative. Nevertheless, the book leaves on the mind an impression of unfairness and onesidedness. To record in full the defects of a nation in its transition stage from oriental to modern civilization without the relief afforded by the background of antique virtues—the loyalty, patriotism, filial love and self-sacrifice for which old Japan was noted—seems as much opposed to the canons of truth as of art.

PROGRESSION AND RETROGRESSION FROM AN EVOLUTIONARY STANDPOINT.*

IT has been generally contended by evolutionists that, as a necessary consequence of the operation of the laws of natural selection, a universal system of progress must have marked the advance of life from its earliest dawn to the present day, and that, correlatively with such progress, the more complex and more perfect organism must have arisen as an outgrowth from the less complex and less perfect. The doctrine of progressive development has met with but little opposition from the professed followers of Darwin and Spencer, and, in fact, it is only very recently that any formulated attempt has been made to show that a converse development could likewise be produced as the result of natural selection. Retrograde development or degeneration, as Professor Lankester aptly urges, truly forms a chapter in

* 'The Past in the Present: What is Civilization?' By Arthur Mitchell, M.D., LL.D. Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1880.

† 'Degeneration: A Chapter on Darwinism.' By Professor E. Ray Lankester, F.R.S., Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1880. "Nature Series."

Darwinism; through its teachings we are led to understand much that has hitherto appeared unintelligible, and facts seemingly antagonistic to the principles laid down by the doctrine of transformism have thereby received an explanation in conformity with that doctrine. The two authors before us treat the general subjects of progression and retrogression, to which their works mainly refer, from widely varying standpoints: the one from the more or less historical, the other from the purely biological.

Dr. Mitchell is manifestly no thorough Darwinist; he believes in the efficacy of natural selection as far as the lower animals are concerned, but denies its action, whether for his mental or physical development, on man, or, at least, on man as we know him through history and archaeological enquiry. He thus falls considerably behind Wallace in the estimation of the operation of nature's forces, since that naturalist, while denying the probability or even possibility of man's environment effecting any material alteration in his anatomical structure, still recognizes in the expansion of his mental capacity the equivalent of physical expansion or development in other animals. But Dr. Mitchell fails to find any evidence tending to prove that man's mental capacity "has actually been favorably influenced by evolution," any more than his bodily form, and concludes from his premises (p. 175) that "the skulls and brains of the fossil man, that is, of the earliest man we know anything about, appear to have been as good as, if not better than, the skulls and brains of the latest, belonging to individuals living in the highest state of civilization." The latter part of this rather naïve statement is probably due to a passage contained in a late address by Virchow, cited from the 'Freedom of Science in the Modern State,' to the effect that the "troglodytes, pile-villagers, and bog-people" have heads so large that many a living person would be only too happy to possess such.

Dr. Mitchell's chief arguments as to the non-applicability of the laws of natural selection to man are based mainly on considerations set forth by Wallace sixteen years ago in the *Anthropological Review*, namely: that isolation, involving a lack of community of action, and of consequence the necessity of self-dependence, is the primary condition of animate objects being brought under the controlling influence of nature's laws, and that so long as this condition of things is maintained there will be a general struggle for existence and a resulting survival of the fittest. The more absolute this condition the more marked and varied will be the effects of natural selection. But man, Dr. Mitchell maintains, nowhere exhibits such a state of complete isolation, or condition necessitating independence of action, action in concert being one of the characteristic traits of the human species. He has everywhere and always, so far as we know, combined with man to combat that universal law, which, through the exercise of his mental power, he alone has succeeded in overcoming. In his case, therefore, there will be no such individual struggle for existence (with attending modifications of structure) which we observe among other animals, and for this reason, it is contended, he holds a position in relation to external forces apart from all other animate beings. Man, in other words, has become civilized; for, in the opinion of our author, "civilization is nothing more than a complicated outcome of a war waged with Nature by man in Society to prevent her from putting into execution in his case her law of Natural Selection" (p. 170). It will be readily perceived that all existing nations of men are civilized, or possess civilization, since "the measure of success which attends the struggle of each band or association so engaged [in defeating the law of natural selection] is the measure of the civilization it has attained." Our author, while admitting the existence of a struggle for existence between the various tribes, races, or nations into which mankind has united itself, denies any possible effect of natural selection upon such associations beyond that of raising them (*by elimination of the less powerful*) to a uniform level, since the law, which, it is assumed, must necessarily operate first upon the individuals composing the aggregates, could effect nothing where, as is alleged, there has been no change in the environments, and where, consequently, no powers have been called into operation which (otherwise little used or needed) might if developed produce "men altered in structure either for the better or the worse." We fail, however, to see the force of the argument, or to detect, as far as the evolutionary process of natural selection is concerned, the essential difference between the conditions which in the one case determine the exercise of the physical powers, and in the other that of the mental powers. An association, it appears to us, holds precisely the same evolutionary relation to the individuals composing it as that which the complete organism holds to its own anatomical parts. It is not the individual requirements of the various tissues of the body which call forth certain modifications of structure in conformity with the law of natural selection, but the requirements of the organism itself which they subserve, and of which they form integral parts. And so in like manner with an association. We are now no longer directly concerned with the respective wants or conditions of its different members—there being no individual struggle for existence—but with the wants and conditions of the association as a whole or unit. Here, as Wallace has so clearly shown, natural selection will react, not upon the physical but upon the mental qualities.

It may with propriety be asked, since we are all civilized, what constitutes the criteria of a high civilization? or, in the language of the author, what are

the data which enable us to ascertain when we have most thoroughly overcome the great law of nature? These are furnished, according to Dr. Mitchell, by the possession of leisure, "that most important of all steps in the history of the march of civilization." But, it may further be asked, has it ever been proved that the savage (in the general acceptance of the term), although he be compelled to hunt and fish for his own sustenance, does not enjoy an amount of leisure equal to that enjoyed by the average civilized man? and may not, consequently, his civilization be fully equal to our own? We believe there are few who will admit this last proposition, yet if the author's interpretation of the term civilization be the correct one we do not see how such a conclusion could readily be avoided.

The early portion of the work, devoted to an account of the primitive manners and customs of the Scotch islanders, their implements, houses, and superstitions, is an attempt made on historical grounds to prove the futility of the reasoning which attaches to archaeological finds an immense antiquity, and to demonstrate the existence already in the Stone Age of an intellectual culture perhaps equal to that of the present day. Although the conclusions arrived at may not generally be accepted, the chapters will, nevertheless, be found worthy of careful reading, and ought, from their suggestive reasoning, to merit the attention both of the specialist and of the reading public generally. Part II. is an examination, in some of its more important bearings, of the question of civilization, and is that to which we have mainly confined our remarks. In Lecture III., in discussing the possibilities of a general advancement, the author expresses himself in decided antagonism to Herbert Spencer, whose views on social evolution he considers a mere speculation. Dr. Mitchell favors the theory held by many that most, if not all, savage races are the degraded remnants of a more civilized people, and from this circumstance argues that "we may safely accept the occurrence of retrogressions as a reality, and the theory of a universal progression as untenable."

Professor Lankester recognizes in an organism three conditions as the result of natural selection: elaboration, balance, and degeneration. The doctrine that, in general, all existing forms of life were maintained in one or other of the first two conditions, was, until lately, considered as one of the foundation-stones of evolution, and it was not until Dr. Dohrn clearly pointed out the wide applicability of the laws of degeneration, as explaining certain anomalies in the way of Darwinism, that any special attention was paid to this third condition. By degeneration, as Professor Lankester defines the term, we are to understand the condition of an organism which, as "the total result of the elaboration of some organs and the degeneration of others," is lower (the animal being "fitted to less complex action and reaction in regard to its surroundings") than that of the ancestral form to which it may be compared, whether "actually or in imagination." The author instances as the immediate antecedents of degenerative evolution: 1, parasitism; 2, fixity or immobility; 3, vegetative nutrition; 4, excessive reduction of size; and arrives at the general conclusion that "any group of animals to which we can turn may possibly be the result of degeneration," and that "accordingly, whenever we can note that a group of organisms is characterized by habits likely to lead to degeneration" (such as above enumerated), "we are justified in applying the hypothesis of degeneration, even in the absence of any confirmatory evidence from embryology." From these premises, Professor Lankester argues, we may safely look upon the sponges, polyps, corals, moss-polyps, and star-fishes as examples of true degeneration, no less so than the tunicate mollusks, which the recent remarkable embryological researches of the Russian naturalist Kovalevski have proved to be nothing but degraded vertebrates. Viewed in this light, certain supposed irregularities in the chronological succession of life, a circumstance forcibly insisted upon, among others, by Barrande, as destructive of transformism, such as the occurrence of the cephaloporous mollusca in strata more ancient than those characterized by the oldest known species of the *Acéphala*, receive their explanation, for, as in the present case, we are justified in concluding that these lower types are only the degenerate representatives of the more perfect types that preceded them. The importance of this method of palæontological interrogation has been pointed out by Professor Perrier, in his recent address to the biological section of the French Association.

Primer of French Literature. By George Saintsbury. (New York: Macmillan & Co.)—The readers of Mr. Saintsbury's admirable sketch of French literature in the ninth edition of the 'Encyclopædia Britannica' will be glad to have their attention drawn to this shorter and more general outline, which should be in the hands of every French student. In the brief compass of one hundred and thirty-eight 16mo pages the author has, in his own words, "set before the learner such a general view of the outline of French literary history as he may best be able to fill up for himself afterwards. No writer of importance has been omitted, and the literary tendency of all such persons has been indicated, though of necessity in a kind of shorthand." This task has been very satisfactorily accomplished; the older literature has been fairly dealt with, and in spite of its necessary condensation the work has a literary value of its own, being singularly free from the perfunctory tone of such

manuals. We have noticed an occasional slip of the pen, as on p. 18, where 'Le Castolement d'un Père' is spoken of as translated or adapted from the Arabic, whereas it is a translation of the Latin 'Disciplina Clericalis,' which was compiled from Oriental sources; and we cannot agree with all the author's judgments, that on George Sand, for example, hardly laying emphasis enough on her style. Indeed, the final chapter on "Contemporary French Literature" is much the weakest, and if it were not that its predecessor on the "Romantic Movement" is one of the best, we should be inclined to think that Mr. Saintsbury had tired of his task toward the end. His treatment of the drama is at all times a little inadequate (excepting only the clear and simple and altogether admirable account of its genesis), and especially unsatisfactory is his criticism of the dramatists of our own day. To describe Scribe as "the most prolific of recent French dramatic authors, but distinguished from the Romantic school by a loose and careless style and by vulgar and unpoetical thought," is to miss entirely the characteristics of the man who first made play-making as easy and as intricate as watch-making. The two or three lines given to M. Émile Augier, the foremost French dramatist of our generation, and to M. Sardou, the most popular, are in the first case insufficient and in the second inaccurate. And quite out of proportion is the space given to the patriotic but feeble dramas of M. Henri de Bornier. The entire absence of bibliographical references is to be regretted.

La Sociologie d'après l'Ethnographie. Par Charles Letourneau. [Sixth volume of the 'Bibliothèque des Sciences Contemporaines.'] (Paris: Reinwald; New York: F. W. Christern. 1880. Pp. 581.)—After briefly discussing the number and distribution of the human races, the author divides his volume into five books, treating respectively of the nutritive, sensitive, affective, social, and intellectual life of man. In the first book unusual importance is ascribed to the discovery of the art of cooking. Not only the physical but the social condition, especially that of women, was improved, and the art of pottery was developed when man became comparatively omnivorous by learning to boil his food. The habit of drunkenness, although implying much skill in the preparation of beverages, was acquired very early, to check hunger and appease pain. The second book begins with a long account of the sexual instincts of primitive tribes. The instinct of ornamentation shows itself as soon as sight is well developed. Up to this point man is only an animal, and the affective and intellectual life is an "epiphenomenon." A fundamental assertion of the third book is, that reflex-action is vastly modified by race and civilization. The cerebral equilibrium is very unstable, at the mercy of the slightest and most manifold incidents of life in higher races or in individuals. Politeness and ceremonious forms are at first copies and at last survivals—often fragmentary and distorted enough—of reflex-action, which are as native to our physiological constitution as the wagging of a dog's tail or the pricking of a horse's ears. From a study of burial customs our author concludes that most races believe in only a temporary duration of the soul after death. They are so intoxicated by the fever of life that they cannot readily accommodate their mind to the fact of death as it really is, and hence their faith is not in immortality but in a delayed mortality.

From his survey of the customs of inheritance M. Letourneau is convinced, as Lassalle was, that the child's right to the father's property is an acquired one, and argues, as J. S. Mill did, for a "modest maximum of heritage," to be gradually diminished till most, if not all, individual property is reduced to usufruct. Family ties, he thinks, are relaxing; the authority of the parent has become almost inversely as the obligation of the child to him. As the hold of the head of the family upon its members decreases, the duties of society to them increase. It must teach them better, and ensure, at least, that a life of honest and useful labor shall not end in misery. While the affective side of family life is thus diminishing, and the family is being absorbed in the state, the scientific spirit will continue to occupy itself more and more with heredity and consanguinity, direct and collateral, with results of great practical significance for the more remote future of the race. The author lays great and redoubled stress upon the assertion that morality is very tardily and feebly developed; that high character is a common cause of failure; and that Europe, "while justly proud of her mechanical and industrial civilization, is not yet good or honest." The conclusion of the last book is that the division of labor has caused such disparity of knowledge and goods that unless vast reforms are soon wrought we must look forward to a future of social convulsions which will imperil our civilization.

The plan of the book is extremely comprehensive, and the author's reading has been wide; but, while complaining of Spencer for forcing sociological facts into accordance with the laws of biology which he had previously expounded, M. Letourneau, who has also written a biology, reverts often in the second, and still more in the third book, to his own biological formulæ. This is, of course, to a great extent just and necessary, and perhaps our objections ought, after all, to rest more against his reproach of Spencer than against his own practice. His book is well written; and, while the author

contributes comparatively little that is new in matter or method, it is quite worth reading.

The Great Navigators of the Eighteenth Century. By Jules Verne. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1880.)—This work covers a period of maritime enterprise that will never lose its charm, comprehending as it does the achievements of Cook and his predecessors, the voyages of the French, explorations in Asia and Africa, together with observations by sailors and savants in North and South America. The list extends from Selkirk to Humboldt, while a preliminary chapter gives an account of "The Astronomers and Cartographers," and an estimate of the work done by them during a century that witnessed so many interesting and important ventures on land and sea. As respects dramatic interest and style, this volume, which is the third of the author's series devoted to the exploration of the world, has little or no advantage over the better class of English and American books having the same scope; yet an improved method has been pursued, inasmuch as care has been taken to indicate precisely the results accomplished within a given period. This is done, in part, by the aid of maps indicating to the eye the exact progress of exploration. The author clearly shows a disposition to meet the growing demand for more thoroughness in treating the entire department of historical geography. The portraits and views add to the interest of the work; but it is necessary to call attention to the fact that both the translator and the printer show too much haste in the effort to make an early market.

La Reliure Française, depuis l'invention de l'imprimerie jusqu'à la fin du XVIIIe siècle. Par MM. Marius Michel, Relieurs-Doreurs. (Paris: Damascene Morgand et Charles Fatout; New York: J. W. Bouton.)—MM. Marius Michel have furnished for the connoisseur of book-binding an elegant monograph. The subject needs, for such connoisseurs, no apology; the story is interesting even to those who have never given to book-binding a serious thought; and the book itself, even without being bound and gilded at the hands of its authors, is already an *objet de luxe*. The illustrations do not all exhibit the art of the heliogravist, if that is what he calls himself, to special advantage, but they do high honor to the art of the book-binder, and that is their main purpose. The text is just long enough, full of information about persons and things, and written in a style at once serious and light, as becomes the serious discussion of so trivial a subject. The curious technical processes of binding, and especially of gilding, are rather illustrated than explained, and the raw material of history—the dates, anecdotes, and genealogies which would have encumbered the text—forms an appendix for which the amateur of book-binding may well be grateful.

Beginning with the time of Charles VIII., and continuing the history to the outbreak of the French Revolution, the book celebrates the triumphs, first, of the monkish book-binders, and then of the famous Les Eves, Le Gascon, Padeloup, De Rome, and Dubuisson, and of an unknown artist who, at the end of the reign of Louis XV., promised for a season to revive the glories of a better day. But this delicate art, which had barely been kept alive by the fostering enthusiasm of fastidious connoisseurs, flourishing most in the cool shade of private patronage, perished outright in the full sunshine of popular favor brought upon it when Madame Du Barry, who could hardly read, brought handsomely-bound libraries into fashion. Of a sudden the art became a trade, and the race of original artists was pushed off the stage by the crowd of imitators who sprang up on every side to supply the new demand. The graceful fashions in design which for a few years gave distinction to the reign of Louis XVI. came too late to revive an art which of all others was perhaps best adapted to profit by their influence. Long before the time of Fay and Salembrier the art of the *reliure-doreur* had, if we may believe our authors, ceased to live.

Brief and unimportant as is this chapter in the history of art, it is by no means devoid of interest and value. It furnishes on a small scale a perfect example of what is meant by decorative art, and capably illustrates the influences to which all decorative art is subject. In the first place, the gilding of designs on the outside of books is decorative art pure and simple, without a trace of useful motive. The study is as much a study of pure form as any the history of art can offer, and the best results, as here shown in the work of the half mythical Le Gascon, whose masterpieces, dated during the middle half of the seventeenth century, mark the culmination of the art, are as purely ideal as the decoration of Greek vases or of Indian rugs. Here, as everywhere in the best decoration, the imitation of natural forms is conspicuous by its absence, the few examples of it to be found in these plates proving the rule by their exceptional position. It is interesting to notice, also, here as elsewhere in the history of these arts, how they borrow from each other, the earlier examples deriving their patterns from mediæval manuscripts and wall-paintings, the next from Oriental faience, the last from laces and embroideries. Throughout, their beauty is owing not to the worship or the study of nature, but to the grace and balance of form and harmonious composition of line, to which the beauty of nature itself is due.

The Young Folks' Cyclopædia

OF

PERSONS & PLACES.

By John D. Champlin, Jr. 8vo, illustrated, 936 pp., \$3 50.

"A companion volume to his 'Young Folks' Cyclopædia of Common Things,' the two together form a miniature library of useful information, biography, travel, and story. It admirably fills the place of a classical dictionary for young people. This is a book that has novelty and wear in it."—N. Y. Tribune.

The Trumpet Major.

By Thomas Hardy. 16mo (Leisure-Hour Series), \$1.

A Dreamer.

By Katharine Wylde. 16mo (Leisure-Hour Series), \$1.

HENRY HOLT & CO., New York.

For New Year's.

Many who have been made happy at Christmas wish to reciprocate at New Year's, and a charming little gift, bound in white and gold, is

'VERSES.' "This is the modest title of a beautiful little volume of such sweet and pure poetry as has made the name of Susan Coolidge beloved by thousands. . . . There is one thing about them—call them verses, poems, or what you will—the 'common people' can understand them, love them, and be cheered and strengthened by them," says the *Christian Standard*. Price \$1. Sold by all booksellers. Mailed, post-paid, by the publishers, ROBERTS BROTHERS, Boston.

The American Poets' Calendar.

Beautifully illustrated. The most artistic and interesting issue of the year. Quotations for every day, from

LONGFELLOW, WHITTIER, BRYANT, AND LOWELL,

With colored illustrations of scenes from famous Poems.

Now ready at all book-stores. Price 50 cents, and sent, post-paid, by the publishers,

LOCKWOOD, BROOKS & CO.,
351 Washington Street, Boston.

BANGS & CO., Auctioneers,

739 and 741 Broadway, New York,

Will sell MONDAY, January 17, and following days,

THE LIBRARY OF A. OAKLEY HALL, ESQ.,

Comprising a very full collection of ENGLISH and AMERICAN DRAMATIC LITERATURE, with a large number of illustrated volumes, many SCARCE TRIALS and LEGAL PAMPHLETS, JOURNALISTIC LITERATURE, POETRY, FICTION, etc., etc.

A Reply to Tourgee's 'Fool's Errand.'

By WM. L. ROYALL, of the New York Bar.

Price 25 cents by mail, post-paid.

E. J. HALE & SON, Publishers, New York.

IVORYTYPES, from life or portrait, \$10.
It is difficult to believe how perfectly a face can be caught from even an inferior photograph. For this reason I guarantee satisfaction. JANE JOHNSTON. Address, Hamilton and Sixty-first Streets, Philadelphia.

*A GENERAL INDEX*TO THE FIRST THIRTY VOLUMES OF
THE NATION

Has been published, and will be sent on receipt of price (\$2 in paper, \$2 50 in cloth) by

Q. P. INDEX, Bangor, Maine,
or Publisher of the Nation, Box 25, New York.

H. J. HEWITT, Printer, 27 Rose St., New York.

Delightful Books

BY

CHARLES DUDLEY WARNER.

"A genial exponent of the best American thought."—*London Examiner*.
"His chief power lies in the rich humor which pervades both thought and style. In this quality he ranks far above every other American writer."—*The Churchman, New York*.

MY WINTER ON THE NILE.

New edition. 12mo, \$2.

"Mr. Warner's pictures of Oriental men, manners, and incidents are, to one who has lived so long in the East as I have, positively photographic reproductions. I saw could a passing traveller so thoroughly appreciate and so sharply outline the peculiarities of all classes of people?"—*Gen. L. P. Di Cesnola*.

IN THE LEVANT. New edition.

12mo, \$2.

"From first to last he has the same unflagging spirit, the same sparkle of humor and power of observation."—*London Standard*.

MY SUMMER IN A GARDEN.\$1. With 21 full-page pictures by Darley.
\$1 50.

"That inimitable creation, 'My Summer in a Garden,' will always be fresh, though it is read for the twentieth time or by the twentieth generation."—*The Churchman*.

BACKLOG STUDIES. Delightful,

Thoughtful, Humorous Conversations on Women Novelists, Clothes, Gothic Architecture in Modern Churches, the Great New England Pic-Line, Social Popularity, and other engaging themes. With 21 illustrations by Hopkin. \$1 50.

SAUNTERINGS. A Record of Travel

in England, France, Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, Bavaria, and Italy. "Little Classic" style. \$1 25.

"Not only thoroughly entertaining but exceedingly instructive."—*New York Evening Post*.

BADDECK AND THAT SORT OF

Thing. Travel to and Observation in Cape Breton. "Little Classic" style. \$1.

"One of the freshest and most enjoyable books of the kind we have ever read."—*The Churchman, New York*.

IN THE WILDERNESS. A new

edition of this charming Adirondack book, with two new chapters. 75 cents.

"As fresh and fragrant of the woods as anything that Thoreau ever wrote."—*Phila. Evening Bulletin*.

BEING A BOY. Illustrated by

"Champ."

"It is an elderly boyhood, the actual boy is full of the dry, master, and is equal to sixty or seventy years of age."—*New York Evening Post*.

BOOKS.

BALLAD AND OTHER VERSES.

By James F. Ball. 1 vol. 16mo, gilt top, \$1.

This volume in addition to the best part of Mr. Fields's previous work, the last of which was printed in 1870, is the choice of the many pieces he has written during the last twenty years. Some of these have appeared in the leading magazines, and have attracted no little admiration for their freshness, humor, and grace.

ON THE THRESHOLD. By T. T.

Munger. 1 vol. 16mo, gilt top, \$1.

A book of thoroughly sensible, judicious, sympathetic, helpful talks to young people on Purpose, Friends and Companions, Manners, Thrift, Self-Reliance and Courage, Health, Reading and Intellectual Life, Amusements, and Faith. Few books for young men, and young women too, are so wholesome and every way excellent as this.

THE LORD'S PRAYER. By Wash-

ington Gladden. 1 vol. 16mo, gilt top, \$1.

A series of chapters designed to bring forth in clear light the comprehensiveness, simplicity, and full significance of this position, which, though repeated for ages, is to-day the natural and sincere utterance of all Christendom. Mr. Gladden's strong common sense, freedom from cant, and healthy religious spirit make this a peculiarly valuable and winning book.

DREAM CHILDREN. By Horace E.

Scudder. A new and greatly-improved edition of this charming book for young folks. Illustrated. \$1.

"Stories delightful alike in feeling and in fancy."—*North American Review*.

* * * For sale by booksellers. Sent, post-paid, on receipt of price by the publishers,

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & CO., Boston.

MACMILLAN & CO.'S

PUBLICATIONS.

THE CHURCH of the FUTURE.

Its Catholicity; Its Conflict with the Atheist; Its Conflict with the Deist; Its Conflict with the Rationalist; Its Dogmatic Teaching; Practical Counsels for its Work; Its Cathedral; Appendices. By Archibald Campbell, Archbishop of Canterbury. 12mo, \$1.

SACRED BOOKS OF THE EAST.

Translated by various Oriental Scholars, and edited by Prof. Max Müller.

Vol. I., Part I. THE UPANISHADS. Translated by Prof. Max Müller. 8vo, \$2 75.

Vol. II. THE SACRED LAWS OF THE ARYAS. Translated by Geo. Bühler. Part I. Apastamba and Gautama. 8vo, \$2 75.

Vol. III. THE SACRED BOOKS OF CHINA. THE TEXTS OF CONFUCIANISM. Translated by James Legge. Part I. The Shu King—The Religious Portions of the Shih King—The Hsiao King. 8vo, \$3 25.

Vol. IV. THE ZEND-AVESTA. Part I. The Vendidad. Translated by James Darmesteter. 8vo, \$2 75.

Vol. V. THE PAHLAVI TEXTS. Translated by E. W. West. Part I. The Bundahis—Bahman Yast, and Shâyast Lâ Shâyast. \$3 25.

Vol. VII. THE INSTITUTES OF VISHNU. Translated by Julius Jolly. \$2 75.

Vols. VI. and IX. THE QUR'AN. Translated by E. H. Palmer. 2 vols. 8vo, \$5 25.

THE ARYAN VILLAGE IN INDIA

and Ceylon. By Sir John B. Phear. 12mo, \$2 25.

THE IRISH LAND LAWS. By

Alexander G. Rickey, Q.C., LL.D., Deputy Regius Professor of Feudal and English Law in the University of Dublin. 12mo, \$1 25.

"To all who, either as legislators or as publicists, are called on to take part in the present controversy the book will prove invaluable."—*London Times*.

LIFE OF WILLIAM BLAKE.

With Selections from his Poems and other Writings. Illustrated from Blake's own Works. By Alexander Gilchrist. A new and enlarged edition, with additional Letters and a Memoir of the Author. 2 vols. 8vo, \$15.

A DICTIONARY OF MUSIC AND

Musicians (A.D. 1450-1878). By Eminent Writers, English and Foreign. With illustrations and woodcuts. Edited by George Grove, D.C.L. In three volumes. Vols. I. and II. 8vo, cloth, each, \$6. Vol. I. A to Impromptu. Vol. II. Improperia to Plain Song.

"It has no rival in our language."—*New York Tribune*.

MACMILLAN & CO.,

22 Bond Street, New York.

